

The Woman's Protest

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Vol. 8
No. 3



ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS AT THE
WHITE HOUSE

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION
OF SUFFRAGE LOBBY

"THE NEW HUMANITY"—
"SUFFRAGE FIRST"

WOMEN NOT INFERIOR

"LEAVE THE QUESTION TO EACH
STATE"

WHY SUFFRAGE WENT TO
WASHINGTON

WHAT THE BALLOT DID NOT DO

DEFEATS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE

A SUCCESSFUL YEAR'S WORK

JANUARY
1916



Subscription, \$1.00 a Year

Single Copies, 10 cents

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

OFFICERS

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Mary S. Ames, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. John B. Heron, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Trenton, N. J.; Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha, Neb.; Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Portland, Me.
Secretary, Mrs. William B. Glover, Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.
General Secretary, Miss Minnie Bronson.

Mrs. A. J. George, Executive Secretary, Congressional Committee.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. John Balch, Boston, Mass.
Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, New York.
Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. C. H. Davis, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. H. E. Talbott, Dayton, O.
Mrs. E. Yarde Breese, Trenton, N. J.

Mrs. Francis D. Williams, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter, N. H.
Mrs. H. F. Lyster, Detroit, Mich.
Mrs. David Conant, Bradford, Vt.
Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon, Ga.
Mrs. J. B. Gillfillan, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mrs. Robert Garrett, Baltimore, Md.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

CONNECTICUT

President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Lynde Harrison, New Haven; Mrs. William B. Glover, Fairfield; Mrs. H. H. Mason, Farmington.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles H. Lawrence.
Secretary, Miss Carolyn Taylor.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William I. Howe.
Press Chairman, Mrs. William B. Williams.

DELAWARE

ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE, WILMINGTON.

Chairman, Mrs. Henry B. Thompson.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. David A. Reinhardt.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Emily P. Bissell.
Treasurer, Mrs. Eugene Dupont, Jr.

GEORGIA

President, Miss Caroline Patterson.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Richard Cuyler King, Mrs. N. K. Troutman, Mrs. J. E. Peacock, Miss Mildred Rutherford.
Secretary, Mrs. B. P. Sutton.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. S. C. Moore, Macon.
Treasurer, Mrs. Flewellen Holt.
Chairman Press Committee, Mrs. Walter D. Lamar.
Chairman Membership Committee, Mrs. Robert J. Taylor.

IOWA

Headquarters, 3 Hippee Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
Secretary in Charge, Mrs. P. H. Alderson.

MARYLAND

Office: 422 North Charles Street, Baltimore.
President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Francis T. Redwood, Mrs. John Haslup Adams, Mrs. Rosalie Straus, Mrs. P. Lea Thom, Mrs. Charles B. Penrose, Mrs. W. P. E. Wyse.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Nathan A. Middleton.
Executive Secretary, Mrs. M. C. Talbot.
Treasurer, Mrs. Michael B. Wild.

MAINE

President, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. F. A. Merrill, Mrs. David W. Snow.
Treasurer, Mrs. Bertrand T. Wheeler.
Secretary, Miss Alice Wood.
Assistant Secretary, Mrs. E. G. Abbott.

MASSACHUSETTS

President, Mrs. John Balch.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. George R. Agassiz, Mrs. Robert S. Bradley, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, Mrs. Henry M. Whitney.
Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman, Walnut Street, Brookline.
Chairman of Executive Committee, Miss Mary S. Ames.
Chairman of Education and Organization Committee, Mrs. William Lowell Putnam.
Chairman of County Committee, Mrs. William Lowell Putnam.
Vice-Chairman of County Committee, Mrs. Edwin Ford.
President Public Interests League, Mrs. B. L. Robinson.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. S. Reed Anthony.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Room 615 Kensington Building, Boston.

MICHIGAN

President, Mrs. Henry F. Lyster.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. L. E. Clark, Mrs. C. A. Kent, Mrs. Charles W. Casgrain, Mrs. Joseph B. Schlotman.
Treasurer, Mrs. James Coalett Smith.
Secretary, Miss Helen E. Keep, 753 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William S. Jerome.

MINNESOTA

President, Mrs. J. B. Gillfillan, Minneapolis.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Walter Richardson, St. Paul; Mrs. Alfred Pillsbury, Minneapolis; Mrs. Edmund Pennington, Minneapolis; Mrs. E. C. Stringer, St. Paul.
Honorary President, Mrs. Johnson W. Straight, St. Paul.
Honorary Vice-President, Mrs. Daniel R. Noyes, St. Paul.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. W. W. Sykes, Minneapolis.
Treasurer, Mrs. H. F. Stevens, St. Paul.
General Secretary, Miss Rita Kelley, 331 Meyers Arcade, Minneapolis.
Executive Committee, Minneapolis, Mrs. J. S. Bell, Mrs. G. H. Christian, Mrs. H. C. Clarke, Mrs. H. Harcourt Horn, Mrs. L. K. Hull, Mrs. C. J. Martin, Mrs. J. H. MacMillan, Mrs. J. R. Marfield, Mrs. O. C. Wyman, Mrs. John Washburn, Mrs. C. C. Webber, St. Paul, Mrs. D. F. De Wolf, Miss Mary Davis, Miss Caroline Fairchild, Mrs. Emerson Hadley, Mrs. A. H. Lindeke, Mrs. J. E. Ricketts, Mrs. C. L. Spencer, Mrs. F. F. Wright.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

President, Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Edson J. Hill, Concord; Mrs. Thomas C. Bethune, Concord; Mrs. Will B. Howe, Concord; Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Portsmouth; Mrs. John R. Spring, Nashua.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, 8 South State Street, Concord.
Treasurer, Miss Carry R. Todd.

NEBRASKA

President, Mrs. Edward Porter Peck.
Executive Committee, Mrs. Henry W. Yates, Mrs. John C. Cowin, Mrs. W. Griffith, Mrs. W. H. Koenig, Mrs. L. F. Crofoot, Mrs. Gerrit Fort, Mrs. John L. Webster, Mrs. Helen Arion Lewis, Mrs. Arthur Crittenden Smith, Mrs. T. J. Mackay, Mrs. F. N. Conner, Miss Janet M. Wallace, Mrs. Frank J. Hoel.
Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. Wm. Archibald Smith, 102 South 35th Street, Omaha.
Mrs. J. W. Crumacker, Special Representative National Association, 1909 Capitol Avenue, Omaha.

NEW JERSEY

Office: 32 West State Street, Trenton.
Honorary President, Miss Dayton.
President, Mrs. E. Yarde Breese.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr., Mrs. Thomas Craven, Mrs. Garret A. Hobart, Mrs. John R. Emery, Mrs. William J. Libbey, Mrs. H. O. Magie, Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Miss Clara Vezin, Mrs. Karl G. Roebbing, Mrs. William S. Stryker, Mrs. Sherman B. Joost, Mrs. Henry M. Darcy, Mrs. Theodore C. Woodbury.
Treasurer, Mrs. George B. Yarde.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. R. C. Maxwell.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Ellsworth A. Corbett.
General Secretary, Mrs. Orville D. Oliphant.
Finance Chairman, Mrs. John Constable Moore.

NEW YORK STATE

Office: 35 West 39th Street, New York.
President, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Eleanor G. Hewitt, Mrs. Fritz Achells, Mrs. George Douglas Miller, Mrs. William P. Northrup.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Richard Watson Gilder, Mrs. Francis M. Scott.
Secretary, Miss Elizabeth F. Gallaudet.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. Church.

NORTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. N. C. Young.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. N. C. Frick, Mrs. J. G. Gundersen, Mrs. E. B. Goss, Mrs. C. E. Wolf, Mrs. T. L. Beiseker, Mrs. L. B. Dochterman, Mrs. H. C. Chaffee, Mrs. R. H. Bosard, Miss M. O. Moyine, Mrs. J. W. Reynolds.

Secretary, Mrs. E. L. Wiswell, Fargo.
Executive Committee, Mrs. N. C. Young, Mrs. W. J. Howe, Mrs. D. B. Holt.

OHIO

President, Mrs. Harry E. Talbott, Dayton.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. W. Austin Goodman, Cincinnati; Mrs. Frank D. Jamison, Cincinnati; Mrs. Joseph A. Jeffrey, Columbus; Mrs. J. H. J. Upham, Columbus; Mrs. John Bradley Greene, Dayton; Mrs. Harry G. Carnell, Dayton; Mrs. Helen M. Lucas, Marietta; Mrs. J. Herbert Roach, Cleveland; Mrs. Charles Orr, Cleveland; Mrs. Milton James, Austin; Mrs. Cyrus Newby, Hillsboro; Miss Alice Bennett, Chillicothe.
Field Secretaries, Miss Lucy Price, Cleveland; Miss Clara Markeson, Columbus; Mrs. Florence Goff Schwarz, Cincinnati.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. MacMillan, 9 Dartmouth Drive, Dayton.

PENNSYLVANIA

Office: 261 South Fifteenth Street, Philadelphia.
Campaign Headquarters: 1108 Finance Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
President, Mrs. Horace Brock.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt, Miss Grace Falkner, Mrs. James Large, Mrs. John Markoe, Miss Mary Newhall, Mrs. Samuel D. Riddle.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles W. Henry.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.
General Secretary and Assistant Treasurer, Miss Laura M. Sloan.

RHODE ISLAND

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Louise C. Hoppin, Mrs. Howard O. Sturges, Mrs. Stephen O. Metcalf.
Secretary, Mrs. A. G. Harkness, Providence.
Treasurer, Mrs. Eliza H. Howard, Newport Branch.
Hon. Chairman, Mrs. Joseph Howland.
Chairman, Mrs. Charles Weaver.
Secretary, Mrs. Ernest Howe.

VERMONT

President, Mrs. David Conant, Bradford.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Edward Kirkland, Bellows Falls; Mrs. M. C. Webber, Rutland; Mrs. N. E. Phelps, Barre, and Mrs. Edward Wells, Burlington.
Secretary, Miss S. Blanche Stranahan, Bradford.
Treasurer, Miss Hattie Brock, South Newbury.

VIRGINIA

Postoffice Box 368, Richmond.
President, Mrs. Francis D. Williams.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Otho G. Kean, Mrs. E. Randolph Williams, Miss Annie Rose Walker, Mrs. Hunsdon Cary, Mrs. E. V. Valentine, Mrs. Arthur P. Wilmer, Mrs. Henry Harwood, Mrs. Hunter McGuire.
Honorary President, Miss Jane Rutherford.
Honorary Vice-President, Mrs. William L. Gray.
Treasurer, Mrs. Lewis Strauss.
Recording Secretary, Miss Maury Robinson.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Chiles M. Ferrell.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Room 320, Oxford Bldg., 726 14th Street.
President, Mrs. C. H. Davis.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Swager Sherley, Mrs. Joseph M. Stoddard, Mrs. Thomas T. Gaff.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. George G. Worthington.
Recording Secretary, Miss Elizabeth Davis.
Treasurer, Miss Alice Card.
Executive Committee, Mrs. Joseph M. Stoddard, Chairman; Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr.; Mrs. E. Rollins Morse, Mrs. George B. Puller, Mrs. Jessie Lincoln Beckwith, Mrs. Douglas Putnam Birnie, Miss Murray Ledward, Miss Anne Squire, Miss Josephine Patten.
In Charge of Headquarters, Mrs. J. Alex. Mahon.

WISCONSIN

President, Miss Mary L. Atwood.
First Vice-President, Mrs. George H. Noyes.
Second Vice-President, Mrs. Frank L. Vance.
Secretary, Miss Gertrude S. Bean, 4 Prospect Avenue, Milwaukee.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ellis B. Usher.

ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS AT THE WHITE HOUSE

"**M**ADAM, you are very gracious, I thank you." It was thus that President Wilson replied to Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, president of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, at the conclusion of the shortest formal speech ever made to the Chief Executive of the Nation.

"Mr. President," said Mrs. Dodge, "we are here to thank you for taking the position that no constitutional amendment should enfranchise the women of this country. Now let me present to you, if you will be so kind, the delegates from the States opposed to woman suffrage."

As the President shook hands with each of the 150 delegates who was introduced to him, he recognized many with whom he had been acquainted, even before entering the White House. To each of these he spoke, readily recalling some incident of the past in the clear-cut and well-meant phrases that have made Mr. Wilson famous in two hemispheres.

The delegation was received in the East Room of the White House, at 10 A. M. on December 14th, the morning following the fourth annual meeting of the association at the Hotel Shoreham.

Immediately after the reception by the President, the delegates were photographed for a panoramic picture, taken for the press.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION OF SUFFRAGE LOBBY

A RESOLUTION asking an investigation of an alleged "suffrage lobby" in behalf of the Susan B. Anthony amendment, and directed particularly at the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage, was offered in the House December 16th, by Congressman James F. Byrnes of South Carolina.

The South Carolina member later issued a statement asserting that "since the opening of this Congress the House office building has been visited by so many women lobbying in the interest of this legislation that the corridors have resembled the shopping district in the days of millinery openings."

Mr. Byrnes said it is currently reported that a fund of \$40,000 has been raised in behalf of the Susan B. Anthony amendment, and he would like to have the House investigate how this money is being expended. His resolution calls for a complete House investigation of the activities of the alleged "suffrage lobby."

"One of the arguments in favor of equal suffrage," said the statement issued by Mr. Byrnes, "has been that it would tend to purify politics, and among other things stop the use of money for the purpose of influencing legislative bodies and the electorate."

"In view of this contention of the advocates of equal suffrage, it is but fair to them to have the House investigate and ascertain whether it is true that more than \$40,000 has been raised and many more thousands are to be raised to influence the action of Congress upon the suffrage movement."

Mr. Byrnes says it is not to be presumed that the \$40,000 is to be spent for literature, and that if any of the money goes to employ agents to lobby, Congress ought to know it. He continued:

"The time of members is being taken up by women who visit their offices and lobby for this amendment, and Congress is entitled to know whether they are paid agents or volunteers in the service. When the Mulhall investigation was ordered there was much less evidence of lobbying and buttonholing of congressmen in the interest of tariff legislation than there is to-day in the interest of the suffrage amendment."

"It is true that a blacklist of congressmen was prepared by the Manufacturers' Association for the supposed purpose of intimidating congressmen, but it is reported that this is also being

done by the Congressional Union, and an investigation will disclose whether the money being raised is to be used for such a purpose. Even if this money be used legitimately, it is unfair for the country to receive the impression that the advocates of the suffrage having confidence in the merits of their proposed legislation, yet find it necessary to raise \$50,000 to \$100,000 to induce this Congress to consider it."

Congressman Nolan, of California, asked the House to take a 20-minute recess that Miss Frances Jolliffe and Sara Bard Fields, two Western suffrage leaders, might address the House on woman suffrage. This plan, which required unanimous consent, was promptly nipped when Congressman Page, of North Carolina, objected, and the suffragists did not come on the floor.

Commenting editorially on the action of Representative Byrnes, the *Philadelphia Inquirer* says, in part:

"We are surprised at Mr. Byrnes, in fact we are grieved that a man eligible to the halls of Congress should be so ignorant. Down in South Carolina they may have some old-fashioned and worn-out ideas about women but they have no place in Washington. Does not Mr. Byrnes understand that the first principle of equal suffrage is that women can do no wrong, and that if they do what is wrong for men to perform the women are still righteous and above the law? If he has not learned this he ought to retire from Congress. The idea that the same standards of political purity should be applied to both sexes is hopelessly out of tune with modern thought."

(From the *Evening Star*, Washington, D. C., Dec. 30th.)

The Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage announces that its fund to secure the enactment of the Susan B. Anthony amendment has reached the \$100,000 mark.

A statement issued by the Union last night suggests that if the contributions during the coming year compare with those received after the convention, Representative Byrnes' proposed committee of investigation will be kept busy trying to keep up with the Union's campaign.

The Woman's Protest

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City.

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.....New York
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. B. Glover.....Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.

Vol. VIII

January, 1916

No. 3



The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers.

There are even greater words than Liberty, Equality and Rights. Lacordaire, during the revolution in France, dared to say to his countrymen: "You have written upon the monuments of your city the words Liberty, Fraternity, Equality. Above Liberty write Duty, above Fraternity write Humility, above Equality write Service, above the immemorial creed of your Rights inscribe the divine creed of your Duties."

"THE NEW HUMANITY"—"SUFFRAGE FIRST"

"WE shall work for a new State, a new civilization, a new humanity. This curious discrimination against women in the matter of the ballot is awakening them to thought, stirring them to resentment of its injustice, and this awakening will lead to a new womanhood, a new motherhood and a new humanity."

So spoke Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, president of the National Suffrage Association, as quoted by the Woman Voter, in a recent address to the Empire State Campaign Committee.

PROTEST readers will remember that in last month's issue we quoted Mrs. Catt's appeal to the New York suffragists as follows:

"Have a printed card to give to people who ask you to do any other work, saying that on account of the deferred enfranchisement of women you must refuse. Let the card say further: 'We are obliged to give ourselves and our money to the suffrage work. Won't you help us so that we can the sooner help you? Let us take this little button [pointing to the one she was wearing] and make its slogan our own: "Suffrage first."'"

Since the National American Woman Suffrage Association elected Mrs. Catt as its official head after both of these utterances, it is obvious that it is in hearty accord with the principles of the "new humanity" that puts "suffrage first."

"A new State, a new civilization, a new humanity" that denies charity to little children in order to send lobbyists to Congress; that knows 15,000 men are dying daily in the greatest of all wars in Europe, leaving widows and orphans somebody must care for, but—"suffrage first."

If the "new womanhood" is to "have a printed card" to give to all who ask for the old humanity that has made our sex famous; if the "new motherhood" shirks its duty to the unfortunate whenever it doesn't get what it wants in politics—Heaven help the "new State" under woman suffrage.

THE VALUE OF NON-PARTISANSHIP

NO one expects suffragists to be consistent, but the reason given by Miss Anna Shaw, retiring president of the National Suffrage Association, for the selection of an Eastern woman as her successor, is certainly an excellent anti-suffrage argument:

"Any Western woman *would be a voter*, and therefore either a republican or a democrat or a progressive. Her *party affiliations would mar* the purely *non-partisan* attitude which the National has always maintained. We cannot afford to prejudice any political party against us in the coming crisis." (Italics ours.)

No woman voter can be non-partisan, Miss Shaw believes. Voteless, non-partisan women are the safest and best leaders a cause can have. Woman suffrage would abolish the political freedom which makes such women available. In welfare work, remedial legislation, and civic enterprises, the woman who is out of politics is the most trusted and efficient official—but we never expected a convention of suffragists and their retiring national president to admit it.

WOMEN NOT INFERIOR

There are signs that the suffragists themselves are gradually beginning to see the absurdity of classing women with "paupers, criminals and idiots," and referring to the position of women as "slaves." No anti-suffragist contends that woman is inferior to man. They insist that woman would be lowered in many ways by her attempt to become man's political equal. But suffragists, ever since John Stuart Mill's "Subjection of Woman," and the days of Susan B. Anthony, have compared unenfranchised women with slaves at every opportunity.

Consequently, we are surprised that Dudley Field Malone, a suffragist, recently delivered an address containing the following sound anti-suffrage doctrine:

"It is an old and patronizing notion that woman is inferior to man. * * * To say that she is inferior to man because she is not physically equipped to do the same laborious service as man is quite as intelligent as to say that, because a man cannot perform the greatest function of life—bear children and be a mother—therefore man is inferior to woman. Man and woman are complementary to each other."

Among anti-suffragists we do not believe that one man or woman can be found who will not indorse Mr. Malone's views given above.

It is the suffragists who have continuously insisted that woman without the ballot is inferior; it is they who have had this "old and patronizing notion" that in order to show her equality with man she must do man's work in man's way. When a suffragist—or a suffragist newspaper—wants to show woman as a candidate for the ballot she is always posed doing something that is distinctly masculine. A recent review of suffrage in the last year makes a long list of the activities of women in war time. The official suffrage organ boasts of the alleged ability of women to make better shells than men. A number of women are exhibited as having led armies, or as serving in them with distinction. All this, according to the "old and patronizing" notions of suffragists, proves that woman is man's equal.

As a matter of fact, woman's employment in emergencies at man's occupations no more proves her fitness to take up the entire burden of the ballot and government than man's occasional engagement as a cook proves his fitness to exercise the "greatest function of life" as a wife and mother. Mr. Malone is right. Motherhood is the one distinctive achievement in which man can never hope to equal woman. And to perform that one greatest function well, woman needs all the freedom from man's duties that a busy world can give her.—M. E.

PROCEEDINGS OF FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION

THE fourth annual meeting of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage was held at the Hotel Shoreham, Washington, on Monday, December 13th.

The morning session was taken up in the reading of the papers which follow under separate headings, and in the reports of the various States.

The following delegates were present:

Connecticut: Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Mrs. J. H. Rose, Mrs. J. G. Calhoun, Mrs. M. M. Jacobus, Miss Virginia Brown, Miss E. Burnell, Mrs. Simpson, Mrs. Lynde Harrison, Mrs. William Glover, Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Henry M. Sykes, Mrs. Hamlin.

Delaware: Mrs. Henry B. Thompson, Mrs. Saulsbury, Miss Emily P. Bissell.

Indiana: Mrs. Cullop.

Maryland: Mrs. Francis T. Redwood, Mrs. Michael B. Wild, Mrs. Rosalie Strauss, Mrs. T. Garrison Garrett, Mrs. L. Edward Miller, Mrs. Henry B. Jacobs, Mrs. P. Lea Thom, Mrs. Herbert T. Tiffany, Mrs. Kirby Flower Smith, Mrs. Charles G. Hill, Miss Groverman, Mrs. Campbell Mortimer, Miss Holt, Mrs. William P. Wyse, Mrs. M. C. Talbot.

Maine: Mrs. J. E. A. Merrill, Mrs. Henry F. Picking, Miss White, Mrs. Bradstreet.

Massachusetts: Mrs. John Balch, Miss Evelyn Sears, Mrs. Reed Anthony, Miss Julia Prendergast, Mrs. Edwin Ford, Miss Sprague, Miss E. M. Tower, Mrs. J. Backus, Mrs. Winthrop Dupree, Miss Paula Dupree, Mrs. A. J. George, Mr. Turner.

Minnesota: Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Mrs. Edmund Pennington, Mrs. E. C. Stringer.

Nebraska: Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Mrs. William Archibald Smith, Mrs. Arthur C. Smith, Mrs. Frank J. Hamilton.

New Hampshire: Mrs. George H. Moses, Mrs. Frank W. Hackett, Mrs. Sumner Thompson.

New Jersey: Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Mrs. Christian, Mrs. Theodore C. Woodbury, Miss Ogden, Miss C. W. Stewart, Miss Frances Cropsey, Miss Clara Vezin, Mrs. O. D. Oliphant, Mrs. Sherman B. Joost, Miss Hatch, Mrs. Edward C. Keasby.

New York: Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, Mrs. John A. Church, Mrs. Arthur Francis, Miss Florence Rhett, Mrs. Alice Foote McDougal, Mrs. Fritz Achelis, Mrs.

William A. Bartlett, Mrs. K. B. Lapham, Mrs. Charles S. Fairchild, Mrs. John F. Maynard, Mrs. Everett P. Wheeler, Mrs. Arthur S. Post, Mrs. William S. Carter, Miss Mary G. Kilbreth, Mrs. Homer Foot, Jr., Mrs. George W. Phillips, Mrs. William Barclay Parsons, Mrs. James W. Hazelhurst, Miss Minnie Bronson, Miss Charlotte W. Roe, Mrs. William B. Smith, Mrs. Edward Shumway, Mrs. Gustav Juan, Mrs. Donaldson Clark, Mrs. George D. F. Barton, Mrs. George Douglas Miller, Mrs. Arthur Francis, Mrs. Knight Neftel, Mrs. John F. Mayard, Miss Reed, Miss Curran, Mrs. J. Willetts, Miss Emma Lansing, Mrs. Burton Shaw, Mrs. Hubbard, Mrs. Edgar Hendricks, Miss Ackroyd, Miss Emily Rankin, Mrs. Shirley.

Ohio: Mrs. H. E. Talbott, Mrs. Lawrence Maxwell, Mrs. Florence Goff Schwarz, Mrs. John Bradley Greene, Miss Lucy J. Price.

Pennsylvania: Mrs. Horace Brock, Mrs. James Large, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt, Mrs. George P. White, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose, Miss Florence Hall, Mrs. Jno. T. Spencer, Miss Jackson, Mrs. Bissell, Miss Scully, Mrs. Jno. Woodwell, Mrs. H. A. Mackesney, Mrs. W. J. Holland, Mrs. Harman Denny, Mrs. W. W. Blackburn, Mrs. George B. Shea, Mrs. J. H. Sternberg, Miss Hoeveler, Mrs. McMeichen, Mrs. Thomas Gillespie, Mrs. J. B. Heron, Miss Eliza Armstrong, Mrs. Ross, Mrs. Jno. P. Knable, Mrs. Thos. W. Andrews, Mrs. L. A. Schaeffer, Miss Mary D. Ashbridge.

Vermont: Mrs. Clarence Morgan, Mrs. David Conant, Mrs. G. P. Whitney.

Virginia: Mrs. E. Randolph Williams, Miss Maury Robinson, Miss Evelyn Gordon, Miss Carolyn Preston Davos.

Wisconsin: Mrs. E. E. Estabrook, Mrs. W. H. Austin.

Washington, D. C.: Mrs. Robert Lansing, Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Mrs. C. H. Davis, Mrs. Swagar Sherley, Mrs. Joseph M. Stoddard, Mrs. Thomas T. Gaff, Mrs. E. Rollins Morse, Mrs. Douglas P. Birnie, Miss Josephine Patten, Miss Murray Ledyard, Mrs. Philip Sheridan, Mrs. Woodbury Blair, Mrs. Robert Thompson, Mrs. Henry Todd, Mrs. W. C. Heron, Mrs. Theen, Mrs. A. W. Dunn, Miss H. Squire, Mrs. G. B. Puller, Mrs. Caldwell, Mrs. E. C. Atwood, Mrs. Merriman, Mrs. Hopkins, Mrs. Victor Kauffman, Mrs. Merwin, Miss Brehaut, Mrs. W. H. Brownson, Miss Anne Squire.

THE REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

MRS. ARTHUR M. DODGE

WITH gratitude for the past and confidence in the future, I have the honor to present this fourth annual report of the national opposition to woman suffrage. Never before has the chronicle of the year's activity been so full of promise for the future. In the legislatures of seventeen States various propositions looking toward the enfranchisement of women were defeated.

In four great Eastern States containing an aggregate population of one-quarter of the entire population of the United States the voters at the polls most decisively defeated amendments to State Constitutions which carried full suffrage to the women of the States—New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts and New Jersey.

The voters have asked two questions. First, Is woman suffrage expedient? And their common sense has lead them to say "No." Second, Do the majority of women stand behind this demand for the vote? And the negative reply has emphatically followed the investigation of fact.

It has been shown by the size of the vote cast on these amendments that the voters are being aroused to the importance of the question involved in doubling the electorate, and are seriously considering our arguments and yielding to our acknowledged influence. The adverse majorities in the five campaign States of 1914 where woman suffrage was defeated, forecast this reaction, and the large majorities in our favor in the recent campaign of 1915 fulfill that prophecy.

Recent developments of suffrage activities in the formation of separate national organizations have shown to the public the division of forces and duplication of effort and inevitable dissension among the advocates of woman suffrage.

The old saying that in unity there is strength has never been more fully demonstrated than in the experience of this association during the past year. We have always contended that the national work in opposition to woman suffrage could be done best through one central body and this has been proved. We appear before the public as an undivided body opposed to woman suffrage.

Our State associations have met their local problems, but have so co-operated with the national association that each unit has been an important and essential factor in the general and wider undertakings of the national organization. To preserve this harmony, to show the public a solidarity of purpose and of policy should be our highest endeavor. Such unanimity of action will be our most potent argument so long as varying policies divide suffrage ranks.

During the year the legislatures of three States—Iowa, South Dakota and West Virginia—voted to submit woman suffrage to the popular electorate in those States. We therefore face the need of organized campaigns in those States. The Legislature of Tennessee voted last session in favor of a suffrage amendment, but the question must go before that body in 1917 before it can be submitted to the voters of that State.

As no organization exists in the three campaign States of 1916—Iowa, South Dakota and West Virginia, the state associations represented here to-day are already meeting the situation and co-operating financially and otherwise with the national association towards the formation of associations in those States.

I wish to take this opportunity of thanking you and all working with you in this organization during the recent strenuous and trying campaigns, for your loyalty towards the central organization and your unity of purpose and self-sacrifice in carrying out the policies agreed upon. It was definitely decided upon last spring, that we should maintain the dignity consistent with the women whom we represent and should avoid controversy, notoriety and sensationalism so far as was possible in active political campaigns. This policy has been followed with

a remarkable evidence of self control considering the provocation from the other side. Our speakers and workers have heard themselves called liars at meetings and in the press and have been unjustly accused, according to the mental attitude of the speaker or writer, of being supported by, affiliated with or representing the liquor and vice interests. They have been called traitors to their sex—they have even been sworn at by women. Some of them have had our emblems torn from their clothing by suffragists. Considering the claims of our opponents that they represent the women who are to purify politics and whom the men need in order to change corrupt and questionable political methods, the accumulation of incidents along this line is illuminating.

We deprecate the recent action of the President of the New York State Suffrage Association who recommends that suffragists refuse to take part in any kind of work—charitable, welfare, relief—until they have the vote, and that they give, in excuse, their slogan, "Suffrage First!"

I take this occasion to repeat our platform. We stand for the conservation of the best of American womanhood of all conditions and stations of life, for the preservation of the home, for the retention of the best ideals of preceding generations adapted to the advantages and opportunities given to women under modern conditions. We believe that women according to their leisure, opportunity and experience should take part increasingly in civic and municipal affairs as they always have done in charitable, philanthropic and educational activities and we believe that this can best be done without the ballot by women, as a non-partisan body of disinterested workers.

"LEAVE THE QUESTION TO EACH STATE"

A Letter From HON. JOHN W. FOSTER, Former Secretary of State.

THE following letter was read at the annual meeting by Mrs. Robert L. Lansing, Mr. Foster's daughter, the wife of the Secretary of State:

It is not necessary to enter upon an examination of the arguments advanced in favor of female suffrage to decide upon the merits of the proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution. It involves a more important question;—to wit, a radical change in our constitutional system of government. The electoral franchise is not embraced in the "unalienable rights" described in our Declaration of Independence, but it is one which is granted or withheld in the option of the governing power of the body politic. The founders of our Government in framing the Constitution which was to govern the people of the new republic, decided that the electoral franchise was one of the privileges which it was proper to be reserved to the States of the Union, and for more than a century our experience in government has demonstrated the wisdom of that decision. Our President, who has been a life-long student of our history and constitutional practice, has wisely declared that the question of female suffrage is one which should be left to the several States to determine.

Aside from the question of a radical change in our constitutional system, a brief consideration must decide in favor of reserving the question of female suffrage to the action of each State to determine for itself. In the recent elections four of the most important States in our Union, after a thorough canvass of the question, voted by a decided majority against female suffrage, and yet it is now proposed by means of a constitutional amendment to compel those States to accept what they have so emphatically rejected. The unwisdom and injustice of such a policy is made more clear if we examine other phases of this franchise question.

Female suffrage is not the only electoral franchise, the granting of which is a present question before the people of the several States. It involves the question of race, of labor, of immigration, of literacy, of property. We need only refer to California and other Pacific States which have strenuously opposed

the free admission of the vast Asiatic population, and have sought by every means in their legislative power to restrict or refuse to this class the rights of citizenship and property. It is understood that the Japanese Government assumes the position that no discrimination can be made against their subjects in entering the United States, and in the exercise of all the privileges granted to immigrants from other countries. And a large body of our people, possibly a majority, feel that this position is a just one. But California would deem its sovereign rights invaded and outraged if the Asiatic immigrants should be admitted to the right to vote.

There is a vast population of negroes mainly resident in the Southern States, who, as the result of our great Civil War, were made citizens, but a number of these States have by legal enactment or otherwise kept these millions of people from the polls. Neither Alabama nor Mississippi, for instance, would look with favor upon a Federal Amendment guaranteeing to these people the exercise of the electoral franchise.

A number of States grant to immigrants from foreign countries the right to vote before they have completed their American citizenship. It would hardly be regarded as just to the other States to compel them by means of a Federal Amendment to grant the same right to unnaturalized foreigners residing within their limits. A literacy test restricting the right to vote exists in several of the States; likewise, in some of them a property qualification is prescribed. Doubtless a large majority of the people of the United States are opposed to these restrictions, but as yet it has not been proposed to abolish them by means of a Federal Amendment.

I trust this examination of the existing conditions of the various States will confirm you in your conviction that it is the part of wisdom to continue as a people to walk in the path marked out for them by the Fathers of the Country, and leave the question of female suffrage to the determination of each of the States to which they assigned it. (Signed) JOHN W. FOSTER.

A RESOLUTION NOT "TO TORMENT CONGRESS"

(Passed by The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage at the Fourth Annual Meeting)

WHEREAS, The Congressional Union and the National Woman Suffrage Association have become active before the President of the United States and both Houses of Congress in the support of the proposed Federal amendment to enfranchise the women of this country; and,

Whereas, The President of the United States and the dominant party in Congress have expressed directly and officially their determination not to permit woman suffrage to be made a question for Constitutional action; and,

Whereas, The suffragists must know that their efforts are thoroughly futile, and are making use of the Government for purposes of self-advertising and for exploiting their propaganda; and,

Whereas, A prominent suffrage leader has expressed the purpose of the suffragists to be "to torment Congress," which is being done, during a session which is called upon to solve the greatest national and international problems that have confronted the United States since the Civil War; and,

Whereas, The Congressional Union Convention has passed resolutions declaring that "the enfranchisement of women is more important than revenue, commerce, national defence or international relations."

Therefore, Be it resolved by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, assembled in annual convention, that this organization deprecates and condemns the lack of patriotism exhibited by the suffragists in uselessly annoying the President of the United States and Congress in making a sham fight, which is a scandal and a reflection upon the intelligence of American womanhood; and,

Be It Further Resolved, That this organization regrets that it is compelled, by the afore-mentioned unpatriotic conduct of suffragists to take up any time whatever of the President of the United States, or of Congressional Committees; and that this organization would engage in no political activity in Washington during this session of Congress, but for its conviction that it is the duty of this organization to keep the public informed regarding the reluctance of the large majority of American women to have the ballot thrust upon them and to contradict with facts and incontrovertible proof the misleading statements so often put out by the suffragists; and,

Be It Further Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice-President of the United States and the Speaker of the House.

The Afternoon Session; President Wilson's Invitation

IMEDIATELY after the opening of the afternoon session, Miss Anne MacIlvaine, of New Jersey, informed the delegates that President Wilson, learning that there were many anti-suffragists at the meeting in addition to the delegation of forty which he had previously arranged to receive, extended an invitation to all the women present to attend the reception at the White House on the following morning. Miss MacIlvaine added that the President thoroughly understood and appreciated the motives which led the Association to request him to receive only a small delegation, but that he would be glad to meet all the anti-suffragists present.

When the chairman asked all those who desired to go to the White House to rise, everyone in the hall rose. (An account of this reception is given on page three.)

Then a report was read by the Treasurer, after which the presidents of the various State associations and private individuals pledged their financial support for the coming campaign.

The election of officers, which followed, is given on page two.

At 5 o'clock the delegates and the members of the District Association were given a tea and reception at the home of Mrs. Thomas T. Gaff. About four hundred were present.

WHY SUFFRAGE WENT TO WASHINGTON

THE scene of the ballot battle, decided at the polls by the men of four States in October and November, shifted in December to Washington.

Discouraged at the results of the late election, the suffragists retreated to the nation's capital, as they said, to "torment" Congress into passing an amendment to the Federal Constitution. The Congressional Union, the radical wing of the suffrage army, which is led by a young woman who distinguished herself as a companion of Mrs. Pankhurst in an English prison, rented one of the best known old residences in Washington early in the month as a base of operations for its war against "the party in power."

The National American Woman Suffrage Association, which is "non-partisan" to the extent that it wars on individual candidates of all parties instead of on the administration, was also there to plead for a Constitutional amendment, though some of its leaders frankly expressed their belief that no such amendment can be passed at the present time.

A political straw which shows the way the suffrage wind is blowing was the announcement by the chairman of the Con-

gressional Committee of the National Suffrage Association that the Shafroth-Palmer amendment would not be presented. Despite the fact that the National Suffrage Association almost split in twain a year ago in order to champion the Shafroth amendment, as against the Bristow-Mondell bill, the first measure was promptly repudiated—after the late elections. A study of the difference in the two amendments reveals the reason.

The Bristow-Mondell bill, known as the Susan B. Anthony amendment, which has been introduced into the present Congress as the Sutherland-Mondell amendment, prohibits the State's regulating its suffrage according to sex. It would automatically enfranchise the women of the entire country, if passed by a two-thirds vote of both branches of Congress and ratified by a majority vote in the Legislatures of thirty-six States. The Shafroth bill, however, does not confer woman suffrage directly. It provides that when eight per cent. of the electorate of any State desire it the question of enfranchising women shall be submitted to the voters at the succeeding election. It is essentially a national initiative and referendum amendment.

Some of the States already have such laws, under which even five per cent. of the voters may petition for an election on this subject. A year ago the National Suffrage Association was strong for this measure, and contended that it was impossible to get the Bristow bill through Congress.

Since the last election, however, the National Suffrage Association is not eager to have suffrage submitted to the voters. It would rather force suffrage on the people in spite of the voters. Hence the abandonment of the Shafroth amendment by that body and the approval of the Susan B. Anthony amendment by all suffragists. Of course, it is harder to pass the Bristow amendment now than it was a year ago, when the National Suffrage Congressional Committee spent four days at Nashville trying to con-

vince the Congressional Union suffragists that it was impossible! Four more States have been added at the polls and sixteen in their Legislatures to the list of those which have gone on record as opposed to suffrage.

Nevertheless, the National Suffrage Association, with glaring inconsistency, sent representatives to Washington this year to plead for an amendment that they were told in their national convention a year ago had no chance to pass unless more States were won.

They were given four hearings: before the National Democratic Committee, the Senate Suffrage Committee, the House Judiciary Committee and the National Republican Committee. The anti-suffragists were also heard by all these bodies.

POLITICAL AND CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS

THE first hearing was before the National Democratic Committee on December 7th. The suffragists, as usual, presented their "demand that Congress pass an amendment to the Federal Constitution to enfranchise women." Lacking all other arguments, an attempt was made to threaten the committee by an exhibition of alleged suffrage following in the States where women vote.

Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, president of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, introduced the anti-suffrage speakers with the following words:

"It would seem an idle act for the advocates of woman suffrage to come before this body, which represents the National Democratic Party organization. The Administration has announced that woman suffrage is wholly a State question, not a question for Federal action—and that under no circumstances should it be made a part of a party platform.

"Having in mind this definite announcement from the leader of the party which you represent, we confidently count upon the refusal of this Committee to further the propaganda of any group of suffragists."

Mrs. Dodge then introduced Mrs. A. J. George, who said: "Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the National Democratic Committee, there are many good reasons why the petitioners should not be here to-day. First of all, as I understand, your body has no authority to make promises as to what planks shall be built into the platform of the Democratic National Convention when it meets somewhere in America, some day next summer. In the second place, this is a question which is acknowledged—especially by good Democrats—to be a question for each State to decide—the question of what shall be the qualifications of voters within the territory of each State.

"And in the third place, what would seem to some observers to be a reason that certain petitioners should not come before you to-day is the fact that one of the great bodies heard to-day might be expected to feel some embarrassment in coming before you, for it announced in 1914 a blanket boycott to cover the entire Democratic party of the United States.

"They sent active, organized workers into every double-suffrage State in the country, calling upon the women voters to use every possible means to bring about the defeat of the candidates of the National Democratic Party and of the State Democratic Party of the different States. But in politics one soon forgives his opponent. Here was a curious situation, and this is why, perhaps, you are confronted to-day with the situation that exists. In no State in the Union did your party make such definite gains as in those States where the Congressional Union was working out its boycott. That would seem sufficient reason why the Congressional Union should not be here to-day. The boycott did not work, but it might have been worked against that body coming to you to-day.

"If there are reasons why those petitioners should not have come, there are reasons why we should be here.

"First of all, that paramount reason of the right of the States to determine the qualifications of its electors. And, second, nine very substantial reasons have been furnished by the popular electorate within thirteen months' time. Within thirteen months nine great States—shall I name them? North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Missouri, Ohio, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York and Massachusetts—have all said a ringing "No" to the advocates of the enfranchisement of women. [Hisses from one part of the audience.]

"Sometimes we have evidence furnished us of the fitness of women to assume the responsibilities of government—self-government, I mean. [Laughter and applause.]

"I happen to come from the State of Massachusetts, where on November 2d, those who opposed woman suffrage received the greatest number of votes ever given to any man or measure in the whole history of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and in Massachusetts, in New York, in Pennsylvania and in New Jersey, which States voted on this question (New Jersey voting on it on the 19th of October and Massachusetts and the other States voting on the 2d of November), we have nearly a quarter of the population of the United States. In the nine States which furnish my reason for being here, as a protestant and remonstrant, reside about forty per cent. of the entire population of the country.

"Put it on a political basis, for it is reasonable that you men should place this question on a political footing. What political question is to be solved from the doubling of your electorate? The vote of women divides, just about as men's votes divide, and we find that women do not form a woman's party although their leaders may implore them; they still do just about as the men do, and when they become active participants in politics they find that with all the criticisms they have made before enfranchisement in regard to election machinery, that the election machinery is the best device we have yet found for carrying on our form of government. What political gain is there in sight if you merely double your present electorate?

"There is a tendency, I confess, on the part of some politicians to become very panicky when a woman comes along and says: 'If you don't stand for the things I believe in, I will "do" you!' But you must remember that although the boycott seems to be the political ideal of some suffragists it is by no means the political ideal of the great masses of American women, in or out of politics.

"These are serious times. These are times when your party and the other parties have more grave problems to solve, more sobering responsibilities than have rested on any party since the Civil War. Is it a time to further the propaganda of those who would make fundamental changes in our organic law?

"We have not the motto which is upon the button of the suffrage party, 'Suffrage First'—but throughout this country of ours a great majority of our women have for their motto 'America First'; they know that this far-reaching question can best be considered not by any national body or organization, but can best be considered as a State measure, through the opportunities of education within the State, and because we believe that, we believe that it is a sham battle that they are asking to participate in when they ask to bring the question of the enfranchisement of women before any national body, whether it is a political organization or otherwise. I thank you."

"PAUPERS AND IGNORANT FOREIGNERS"

THE Senate Suffrage Committee heard the suffragists on the 15th. It was before this body that Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, the newly elected president of the National Suffrage Association, made the assertion that the majority in New York against woman suffrage was largely due to the votes of "paupers and ignorant foreigners."

"All the inmates of almshouses and all the paupers were voted by the machine in their attempts to beat our amendment," she added.

It is interesting to know, in connection with this statement, that the majority in New York City was 89,000 of the total of 194,000. Over 100,000 of the majority was from the small towns and counties "up-state," which are not considered, as a rule, to be populated by "paupers and ignorant foreigners."

Strangely enough, the suffragists have never brought any charges of election frauds before anybody authorized by law to punish such crimes. In all the elections held on this subject in recent years, the suffragists have not discovered one individual whom they could indict for casting an illegal vote against their cause. In every State they have offered rewards for the discovery of election frauds against them. No announcement has ever been made of the payment of such a reward or the conviction of anyone. Of course, had suffrage won, even by one thousand, with only one-third of the electorate voting—it would have been a perfectly pure election. The "paupers and ignorant foreigners" would not have been mentioned. The majority would have been due to "progressive and intelligent citizens."

The anti-suffragists who spoke before the Senate Committee on the 21st were Mrs. A. J. George, Miss Lucy J. Price, Mrs. Orville D. Oliphant, Miss Florence R. Hall, Mrs. M. C. Talbot.

Mrs. George denounced the tactics of the suffragists in "tormenting" Congress.

"Questions of international relationships, of preparedness, of the national defense, of finance are vexing the wisest minds," she said. "Is it any time to further the propaganda of this new crop of hyphenated Americans, who place their wishes above every other need of the country?"

Miss Price stated that the amendment was opposed on two grounds—democracy and expediency, the latter meaning the greatest good for the country, and the former that it is against the principle of democracy. "We ask you to allow every State in the Union to decide this question for itself through its voters and through the women of the States," she said.

Later there was a hearing before the National Republican Committee.

"NOT CHIVALRY, BUT JUSTICE"

IT was at the third hearing, held before the House Judiciary Committee, on the 16th, that Mrs. Catt so ably presented the principles of suffrage as opposed to all hitherto existing ideas of democracy and representative government. Six other speakers followed her for the National Suffrage Association. Then Miss Alice Paul introduced twelve representatives to speak for the Congressional Union.

"When suffrage comes in at the door chivalry flies out of the

window," says the New York *Tribune's* Washington correspondent in describing what happened afterward to the suffragists at this hearing. These persistent women, after being turned down by twenty-nine States in thirteen months, demanded that the House Judiciary Committee help them undo the decisions of the people.

For the first time in the history of the appearance of women at the National Capitol, they were treated like men. They did not like it. Hence the complaint about chivalry. A suffragist wants to be a politician, but always feels hurt when men receive her as one.

Perhaps the representative from South Carolina should have been chivalrous first when a suffragist said that his State had no laws regulating the hours of women and children in industry. To frankly announce his disbelief was rather unkind. Therefore, another suffragist, no doubt claiming an inherent right to make any statement she pleased, assured the gentleman from South Carolina that the woman's charge was correct.

"Well, I don't believe it yet!" snapped the representative—and chivalry had flown.

"Unchivalrous" it was for the gentleman to doubt the ladies' attack on his State's laws—but is it not true that the suffragists carry a banner inscribed "Justice, not Chivalry"?

The congressman was certainly quite just. South Carolina is not among the leaders in legislation for women and children, by any means, but it had at least a sixty-hour week and a ten-hour day for women long before Wyoming, with forty-six years of woman suffrage, obtained its present ten-hour day, and South Carolina has a law against night labor for women that neither Wyoming nor Colorado has yet equaled.

Later the chairman questioned the motives of the suffragists.

"You know perfectly well that your amendment is not going to pass this Congress," he said. "Why do you come here and annoy us?"

Undoubtedly he realized that Washington date-lines behind any propaganda are the cheapest publicity any cause can obtain. Whole columns of names of suffragists were published in the newspapers.

A third congressman demanded an investigation of the \$44,000 fund raised by the Congressional Union, treating these lady lobbyists as though they represented "soulless corporations" or "malfactors of great wealth!" But when an organization raises \$1,000 for the specific purpose of "changing the President's mind" and another few thousand to "convert Congress," is it not time for our patriotic legislators to investigate?

The committee even wanted to know about the salaries of the suffrage workers.

"Our organizers are paid \$70 a month, out of which they pay their own expenses," replied Miss Alice Paul, president of the Congressional Union.

From an organization that can raise over \$40,000 at a mass meeting, \$70 a month seems a very small salary, especially if the organizer is to maintain herself in Washington as a lobbyist on that amount. Under the circumstances, would it be called a "living wage"?

Why do the suffragists complain about the lack of Chivalry? They received Justice. The anti-suffragists, acting as women, not politicians, were given both. Every courtesy hitherto extended women at Washington was accorded them at every hearing.

No member bluntly announced his disbelief in their statements. This was probably due to the accuracy of the statements. No "demands" were made by the antis; no funds raised to browbeat and boycott congressmen on the other side; no illegal acts calmly indulged in because men are slow to call women to account as they would other men.

Yet at the end of each hearing it was the suffragist, the politician, who complained of the way she was treated. The suffragist knew her efforts were futile. But she was angry when her masculine methods failed, because it proved that the winning way is a woman's way—not that of the female politician.

"WHAT THE BALLOT DID NOT DO FOR ME"

By ANNA STEESE RICHARDSON

(From *The New York Times*)

THE ballot did not insure me a profitable position. I had to start with other unskilled, untrained workers at a wage of five dollars per week.

The ballot did not increase my wages nor effect my promotion. I had to compete with other workers and outclass them.

The ballot did not improve the conditions under which I worked. I risked my life in fire-traps, precisely as the ballotless women of New York do to-day.

The ballot did not endow me with the ability to vote intelligently. I had to acquire this by study, investigation and bitter experience.

The ballot did not insure me the respect of men for my opinions, political or personal. I had to earn this by the quality of the opinions and by my conduct among business men.

The ballot did not give me justice. I had to fight for this in the court, by the aid of a lawyer, as men must.

The ballot did not bring happiness. I had to achieve this, as every woman must, with or without the ballot.

A small minority of women in the State of New York is asking its legislators to grant the so-called right of suffrage to the great majority of women. As is usual under such circumstances, the great majority is not being consulted. If it was, and if it could express a composite opinion, it would probably pray to be delivered from the responsibility of voting. But the great majority is not spectacular, therefore it is not exploited.

I belong to the unpicturesque majority. I believe I have the right to speak for it, because I have enjoyed those particular privileges supposed to come only by and through the ballot. I have tasted economic independence. I have drawn the same wages as men, provided, of course, that I have delivered the same quality of work. I have deposited my ballot in the same box which received that of the man who carried coal into my cellar and of the man who accepted my note at his bank, charging me the same rate of interest he charged my male neighbor. I have voted several members of my sex into comfortable political berths.

Still I have no desire to vote again, for which state of mind I offer three reasons:

1. I lack the time to study, intelligently, proposed legislation, local political conditions, and the records and qualifications of candidates. By experience I know the futility, if not the danger, of the unthinking, unintelligent vote.

2. I decline to place myself in the large class of New York male voters who make no study of political economy nor of the city's needs, but who exercise their "privilege" blindly and on strict party lines.

3. I know that whatever good my vote might accomplish will be counteracted a thousand times by the ballots of those women who vote according to orders from their own unscrupulous men folk, or who sell their votes, or who are voted en masse by that mighty power, Police Headquarters—the ring.

Such reasons may be construed by advocates of suffrage as an admission of weakness, selfishness, or inefficiency. My conviction that woman suffrage does not work the greatest possible good for the largest possible number is founded on experiences which demanded strength, unselfishness, and efficiency.

Twenty-three years ago, in Colorado, I marched and spoke in the interest of woman suffrage. I was of the rank and file in a small city, but my youthful enthusiasm was worthy of Fifth Avenue and Carnegie Hall. And, like so many women who march to-day in New York, I was able to do this because there was a man who worked while I marched. I was able to address

evening meetings, because that same man stayed home with the babies. We had a most amicable arrangement. He enjoyed the privilege of attending a certain number of lodge meetings each month, and I an equal number of suffrage rallies. On the remaining evenings we tended the babies jointly. I do not recall that the word "feminism" was included in our domestic vocabulary, but we lived it.

The same conditions prevail in New York to-day. The women who do regular work for suffrage must be paid for it, or they have the leisure to campaign because of a competency inherited from some mere male ancestor who accumulated it, or because to-day some man is working that they may march and motor and talk for suffrage. During the past few months I have heard many smartly tailored women cry out against man-made laws and the enslavement of women, and demand economic independence. And I have returned to the domain of money-making to find their husbands chained to the hardest taskmaster of modern civilization—"making more for the inefficiently managed home."

And, watching New York's highly emotional and picturesque campaign for suffrage, I realize that history in Colorado twenty-three years ago is repeating itself here to-day. The same soap boxes and the same arguments concerning the woman in the home and out of it, the moral influence of woman in politics and the unsexing of woman through the coarsening voting booth! An automobile, perhaps, instead of the front seat of a spring wagon or the tail end of a cart, but the same caustic reference to the classing of women with the feeble-minded, the insane, and the convicts.

New and yellower banners and more artistic billboards, but the same outcry against the opponents of woman suffrage as those who belong in the Dark Ages. Even a number of the same speakers and leaders sent out twenty-three years ago from the national headquarters, a trifle grayer as to hair, but not a whit less fanatical and sincere in their fanaticism. And, last but not least, the same old prophecies concerning the betterment of conditions through votes for women. The women of New York to-day are being promised exactly what was promised the women of Colorado twenty-three years ago.

What the great majority of New York women want to know is whether this promise can be kept, whether these prophecies can be fulfilled. Did the advocates of equal suffrage in Colorado "make good"? What would the average woman gain if the woman suffrage amendment was passed? Exactly what would the ballot mean to the woman in the home, whose interests center in its economic problems and its children, and to the woman in gainful occupations with her problems of industrial competition, wages, hours, strikes and sanitary conditions?

The questions uppermost in the minds of New York women to-day do not deal with glittering generalities like a single standard of morality, woman's moral influence in the voting booth, the right of the married woman to be known by her maiden name, but with individual, personal, one might almost say selfish, problems. Fortunately for her country and her home, the average woman of the great majority takes an extremely individual, personal and narrow view of any national or State question.

"What would it mean for me and mine? The rest of the world is unimportant."

The vote is one more responsibility added to those the average woman is already carrying. It is not a privilege. Depositing a strip of paper marked with painstaking "X's" would

not insure the wife and mother better government in her town, better schools for her children, better sanitation on her block and in her home, better protection for her husband and her children at their toil. To secure such ideal conditions she must not only vote, but she must know why and for what she is voting. And, having voted for civic betterment, she must co-operate with the authorities.

It is not enough that she vote for a man who has indorsed city playgrounds for her children, better factory laws for her husband, and the filtration of the water her family drinks. She must learn something about the candidate's record, his reputation for living up to his promises, and the record of the party which nominated him.

As an individual housekeeper, she must then do her part in carrying out the sanitary laws for which she has voted. In New York to-day men make sanitary laws, and housekeeping women break them. What profiteth the family health if a housekeeper vote for a whitewashing appropriation and continue to dump her garbage in her back yard or alley?

The ballot properly used would give New York mothers practical control of the public schools if they were willing to assume the responsibility. This might lead to the correction of many present evils, from extravagant contracts for badly designed school buildings to the appointment of teachers for merit, not for the masculine votes they can influence.

In Colorado the schools are the spoils which fall to women politicians. The State and most of the County Superintendents are women. Yet in school buildings, in educational methods, in the teacher-spirit, Colorado is no more progressive than man-ridden Connecticut.

The ballot in the hands of women should raise the age of consent, improve child labor laws, better conditions in reformatories and all institutions to which children are committed, and safeguard the family circle by what is known as an Employee Compensation bill. But Colorado with its women voters has not the highest age of consent. Last year it rejected the establishment of a Child Welfare Commission. It is so far behind the times that it still commits homeless, dependent children to institutions instead of maintaining a home-finding society, and the inhuman treatment of boys in reformatories became such a scandal that the press, not the women voters, demanded a rigid investigation and a general cleaning out of the politicians and their cruel employees. And its women took no interest in the effort to secure an employee compensation law.

Equal suffrage never has, in Colorado or elsewhere, prevented strikes and labor troubles. It would not work the miracle in New York. So long as greed thrives on man's necessity to work, capital and labor will clash, and so long as women, ignorant of economics, defying the law of supply and demand, offer their services for less than men—and other women—ask, the ballot will not raise their wages nor adjust their differences. Men as well as women worked in the Triangle shirt waist factory in New York, where an infamous fire wiped out the lives of many young girls, but they did not use their ballots to secure and enforce adequate fire-protection. Will women do any better?

Colorado was by no means the first State to pass a minimum wage law, and in both labor laws and wages it is behind Massachusetts, where laws are entirely man-made.

The ballot does not count unless it is used wisely.

There is nothing more amusing to those of us who have voted and watched the effect of the ballot on the home-making woman than the claims of some anti-suffragists that suffrage unsexes the woman, takes her from her home and weakens her interest in her children. The problem of the politician in Colorado is to persuade this home-making creature to use her ballot at all. It requires considerable ingenuity to coax her to the polls, let alone to a political meeting. Understand, now, I am speaking of the mass of Colorado women, who correspond to the unconsulted, uninterested majority of New York women

who are having equal suffrage agitated and lobbied for them without their aid or consent. I am not speaking of the women politicians and office holders in Colorado with whom the ballot is strictly a business proposition, nor yet of the more fashionable club women in the larger cities who make a fad of politics but who wield little practical power.

Here in New York we would have the same three classes of women voters—the women politicians and office holders who would be recruited from the ranks of the present agitators and leaders; the polite politicians who in reality would know nothing about practical politics and whose ranks would include very cultured and charming ladies, and the great majority, who would be curious concerning their first voting experience, would spoil various ballots, and then would become, in all things political, purely apathetic. The practical politicians would know how to manipulate the undesirable female vote. Would the polite politicians show the same enthusiasm for educating the great majority and imbuing them with a sense of ballot responsibility that they show to-day for invading Wall Street, parading on Fifth Avenue, and commandeering the motor cars of rich men for suffrage hikes?

The ballot for women is a grave responsibility and a heavy expense for a few agitators to urge upon a State, unless they are sure that the women whom they claim to represent will use the power of voting. It opens the polls to the women of the undesirable element and the uneducated foreign element, and thereby doubles the power of political rings now controlling the same elements among male voters. It practically doubles the cost of election. And yet its sponsors are doing nothing toward the education of that very desirable voting element, the great majority of home-making—alas! economically dependent—women whose votes will be controlled by the men who love, honor and cherish—or beat them! For every progressive woman who uses her ballot according to the Rand School of Political Economy or the Columbia University system, there will be a thousand who will make their mark on a ballot where it will do the most good according to the light of a district leader or a ward heeler.

No one can appreciate the gravity of the situation in New York to-day more than we who were pioneer voters in Colorado. We meant to use our votes to high ends. We meant to turn out the rascals. We meant to purify politics, but we did not know how. So we fairly girdled our State with corrupt rings. This was not because we were women, but because we used our votes to no better advantage than did the unthinking or unintelligent man, thereby doubling the power of the grafters.

I recall voting for one of my neighbors, the husband of a personal friend, who had been a most genial host in his home. That was guarantee enough for me. He was a good husband, a kind and generous father. Not until long after I had cast my vote did I realize that this most agreeable man was the leader and principal profit-sharer in the most corrupt group that ever held a county in its grasp. But then I deserved no more condemnation than the man in New York who told me quite seriously that he would not vote for a certain candidate because the latter's first name was Vivian.

"Vivian? That's a fine name for a real man, isn't it? There must be something wrong with him."

No looking into the man's record, no thought for his qualifications, just masculine prejudice against the Christian name bestowed upon the poor fellow by his inconsiderate parents. If a woman had followed the same argument in voting her conduct would have been ascribed to biological inequality or emotional instability.

The use to which a vote is put is the only thing which counts, whether the hand that casts it be male or female.

Another time I voted for a man who threw a large volume of trade my husband's way. In the light of later events, I saw that he was unworthy of any citizen's vote. Also I was made to feel a renegade and a backslider in the woman's reform club of which I was a member. But, what would you? The candi-

date's patronage supported my children. Shall a woman withhold the ballot from the hand that feeds and clothes the children she has borne?

Dishonest? Misuse of my voting privilege? Not at all, as I looked at it then, in my inexperience and irresponsibility. To-day, yes, because I understand the power of the ballot for good and evil, because years develop the sense of responsibility. And thousands of women, given the ballot in New York now, will use it to no higher ends, until they have been educated either by the press or by bitter experience in political economy and in appreciation of the ballot's power.

And because I was not prepared to become a voter, because there were thousands of women like me, the first result of equal suffrage in Colorado was to deliver the State into the hands of rings and grafters who belonged in the Tammany Wigwam with the tiger and the Tammany leaders.

This was followed by a spasm of reform, due largely to the emotional and impassioned devotion of the women of Denver for Judge Lindsey. The State brought forth women's clubs instead of millionaire mine owners and bad men. More rascals went out and less came in. There was a general awakening of the public conscience, due not so much to the woman vote as to the fact that Colorado was dropping its youthful crudities and taking on habits of custom and tradition—home-building instead of shaft-sinking.

To-day there is no more delightful sight than a Denver woman's club discussing local politics and candidates in the palm room of the Hotel Savoy. Nevertheless, when I was sent to Denver several years ago to secure certain information for an Eastern magazine, I tarried but a short time among the white-gloved reformers at the Savoy. The information I wanted was possessed by a small, spry, bright-eyed, wrinkled little Irish-woman who is a practical politician, and who will be able to retire when she so elects, to enjoy the comforts which money can buy.

The weakness in the recent campaign is that the agitators and leaders can take the 3,000,000 women of voting age in this State to the suffrage trough, but they cannot make them drink. Woman suffrage would be valuable to a State and a people only if it were used intelligently. Because the leaders cannot deliver an intelligent voting body of women to the State which passes the amendment, they have no right to promise the reforms with which their literature and speeches bristle.

When forced by necessity into the wage-earning field, even with the ballot in my hand, I had to start at the bottom of the industrial ladder and fight my way up as desperately as if I had lived in a State where woman was denied the privilege of voting. Never once did my right to vote effect my working hours, my salary, my opportunities for advancement, the conditions under which I worked. Perhaps conditions have changed in Colorado after twenty-three years of votes for women, but allowing for such influence on the lot of the woman in the home and in gainful occupations, which even suffrage leaders have not yet been able to prove, New York must pass through the same period of storm and evolution.

The great majority who read complacently of the noble efforts made in their behalf by suffrage leaders should waken to a realization that there is work ahead for them—the work of preparation for using the ballot. The factory hand and the business girl must understand that results of suffrage, even in the hands of intelligent, earnest women, are slow. The mere ballot in their hands would work no miracle in salaries, in hours, in the conditions under which work is done, nor in the morals of the men they would marry. Strikes and rumors of strikes would continue in New York as they have continued in Colorado. Competition would not be lessened by the woman's right to vote. Men who can evade building and fire laws would continue to do so, ignoring her vote as they have ignored her father's and her brother's.

Finally, in their mad desire to advance the "cause," the agitators have done the women of New York a grave wrong in creating and fostering sex antagonism. They have accused the men of New York of breaking every commandment in the decalogue of good citizenship. They have shouted against the man-made laws of New York, yet on examination these prove that, instead of discriminating against women, men law-makers have given us a distinct advantage in all questions which concern the rights of the mother over her earnings, her children, her property rights, and her responsibility for debts incurred. They have proved their own unfitness to make laws for both men and women by announcing that they will overturn the political system built by men and substitute not a government for both men and women but for women only.

This is a great injustice to both men and women at a time when women are about to emerge triumphant from a half century of adjustment to new and trying economic conditions. The bitterness felt by men which followed the first invasion of industrial fields by women is fading. The bigger, broader nature of the male creature is accepting the fact that the presence of the woman, driven from her home by social and economic conditions in the various fields of industry, trades, and professions where he once reigned supreme, is inevitable and not altogether undesirable. He has decided that if the woman will play fair so will he.

I question whether we women, similarly placed, would have been as generous.

During more than twenty years of economic independence, sex discrimination has never reared its head in my path. No man has ever refused to pay me full value for my work. Every large opportunity has come to me through some man who considered neither sex attraction nor sex antagonism—only the task and the fitness of the woman to perform it.

There is no room in the scheme of woman's upward progress for sex antagonism, not even for sex independence. What the women of New York, of all America, need is interdependence between the sexes, that men and women may go to the polls to work for their common good, not to rend each other.

The majority of women, through biological evolution and the world-old instinct of wifehood and motherhood, their emotionalism and their tremendous capacity for loving, find in marriage, children, and the home their highest and most satisfying happiness. This mass of women, overwhelming in numbers and influence, resents the efforts of a few women who have already satisfied their craving for wifehood and motherhood, or who, through constitutional abnormality, are denied those natural relations, to widen the social breach between the sexes and thus to interfere with the normal woman's fondest, finest hopes.

So long as suffrage leaders offer the so-called enslavement of women as a reason for conferring the right to vote upon women they raise a false issue. The woman who is a slave to man without the ballot will continue to be his slave with it. This is constitutional, emotional weakness in the individual woman which will not be rectified by a mere slip of paper.

And so long as women agitators employ sex antagonism as an argument for equal suffrage they befog the real issue, which is:

"Do the women of New York want the ballot and will they use it?"

I believe that I voice the convictions of that silent, unrepresented majority when I answer:

"Not yet. Give us time to adjust ourselves to the new economic conditions, to our new relations with men as wage-earners. Let us learn the value, the power of the ballot and how to use it."

And until they have done this experience has taught me that they will not use the ballot, even if it is forced upon them.

"TERRIBLY INTERESTING AND SO INSPIRING"

By LUCY J. PRICE

"OH, did you go to the suffrage hearing at the Capitol last month?" cried Marie Clarice, powdering her nose enthusiastically.

"Really, didn't you? How dreadful! It was such a lovely hearing, so conversational, before the Judiciary Committee—whatever that means—and I do think we ought to keep up on all the new movements, don't you? Now that I've joined the Woman's Peace Party and the League for Increased Militarism, I feel as though I were taking a responsible part in life, don't you know, taking both sides of a subject like that. I felt the same way about suffrage, but when I heard that you couldn't very well belong to both the suffrage and the anti organization, why, of course, I joined those women who were working for suffrage, because it's so much more interesting to belong to the side that's trying to do something different, so much more dramatic, you know. I couldn't think of any way you could sing the Marseillaise in the anti-suffrage cause or anything like that. And I just must have things dramatic. It's my temperament.

"You see, we aren't really prepared for war and yet we aren't definitely committed to eternal peace at any price, so both of those leagues of mine are working for something different, so both suit me quite well. I don't believe in being narrow about theories.

"Well, anyway, I went to the suffrage hearing. A girl stood at the door of the committee room where the hearing was held and asked everyone if she had a card, everyone who wanted to come in. Some of them acted surprised and I thought really as though they quite belonged to the plain people and didn't understand things, because they said, abruptly, you know, 'Why, do we have to have cards to get into a public Congressional hearing?' and then the girl smiled in that superior sort of way that I always think is a mark of good breeding and said, 'Oh, no, certainly not, but please be seated in the rear then.'

"Wasn't that clever? You see, they didn't want any antis in front. I thought it was a wonderful thing to think of because at the anti hearings the suffragists always got in the front seats to make a good showing, and you see doing it this way this time just showed that precedent, even their own, didn't bother them at all. That's one thing I like about the suffrage movement, ignoring all such bourgeois things as precedent.

"They certainly had some lovely speeches. Dr. Shaw spoke first and then Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, the new president of the National Association, you know, and the one they say is the cleverest of them all.

And then in the afternoon the Congressional Union people spoke, and it did add such a zest to things having them there because they didn't agree with many of the things the morning speakers said at all, and not even with the things each other said and it made it SO much more enlightening, I thought, to get absolutely contradictory ideas about the same things, even their own policies, from people of the same organization. Don't you think so? Just the sort of thing that an artistic temperament like mine demands.

Anyway, it was all terribly interesting, and so inspiring! For instance, when Mrs. Catt told the committee that our Government is controlled by blocks of ignorant, foreign, corrupt voters who are driven to the polls and voted, yes, just DRIVEN there. Even the committee looked startled. You see they had been in politics for ever so long and had never realized that before. It was wonderful and so thrilling. She said the reason the suffragists didn't want the States or the voters to have anything to say about whether or not they should have woman suffrage was just because of that, because they were all so corrupt and ignorant, and I didn't blame her at all for feeling that way. Just imagine some stupid ignorant person, who might even belong to the employed class voting for an intelligent woman like me, for instance! It was so brave, too, I thought, for her to come right out like that because you see the suffragists have been talking democracy all the time. I heard it so much in our last campaign that it became positively automatic with me. When mother would insist on asking why I wouldn't wear more clothes or come down stairs to breakfast, I would just answer, "Democracy," and never had to give any other reason for doing as I wanted to about things. You know how handy a slogan like that is. Well, so you see that was one reason they gave last fall for asking the vote. And so I thought it was wonderful to come right out and declare that they didn't trust the voters at all and that they shouldn't even be given a chance to vote on things. Because, of course, we feel just the same about having them vote on other things that we would on this question. I tell you our popular elections are VERY dangerous things. I learned that during that hearing, if I didn't learn anything else. And for us to come right out and say so after all that other talk just showed again that we aren't going to be bound by precedent. My brother said it was inconsistent. But that's silly. They used the other argument when they were talking to the voters. Now when they were talking to a selected body they took a different point of view. I

think that's the very essence of consistency, don't you? Men are so unimaginative. It's just as Mrs. Catt said. There are only two ways of getting the vote. One is to let the States decide it for themselves and the other is to take all choice away from them. The first didn't work and so naturally we are demanding the other. I call that more than consistency. I call it statesmanship. And then, again, when you realize that those committeemen had been elected by those blocks of ignorant, corrupt voters, it just makes you understand again how brave it all was, and the same time, how consistent.

"One of the committeemen was very stupid and he didn't seem to understand about how our government was controlled by such votes, even after another speaker, one of the Congressional Union, had told them about it. And he actually interrupted her to ask her again about it. I suppose he couldn't believe it because it was a new idea. You know men NEVER have a new idea, never have had in all our political history. Oh, yes, that's very well known. I've heard any number of speakers say so.

"Well, the committeeman said, 'Do you mean to say that the mass of the voters are more corrupt than the legislative bodies?' and the girl answered just as undauntedly, 'I do.'

"Just think how wonderful politics is. Here these dishonest men with votes right in their hands, controlled by still more dishonest men, go to the ballot boxes and drop in their corrupt votes and elect good, honest, men. Isn't that wonderful? You'd never think it would be possible, would you? I shouldn't either if I hadn't educated myself by joining these new movements. Now ordinarily you'd think that if they'd vote for honest men, they'd vote honestly on measures, too, especially something like woman suffrage that they and their wives could talk over together. But you see it doesn't work that way at all. And it was so inspiring to hear it because it just showed how wrong our whole political system must be.

"There was another thing, too, that showed two things, first how mistaken men are, and second how interesting old ideas are if they are old enough so that we have to change things in order to go back to them.

"Mr. Chandler, a New York gentleman on the committee, said to Mrs. Catt, 'You know I am a suffragist. As a citizen I voted for it. But my constituents voted "no." Now, isn't it my duty as their representative to represent them on a matter on which they have expressed themselves?' And Mrs. Catt's voice rang out so oratorically when she cried, 'It certainly is not.' Just think!

"You see how wrong we've been. A few years ago people would have agreed with her, but lately we've been going foolishly away from the idea of such independence

on the part of a representative and we think that this is a democracy and that he must really represent his people. But you see we're wrong now.

"Oh, yes, I don't insist that the things I belong to must be really new but only that they must compel a change from something which exists at the present time."

1915 DEFEATS

THE official figures for the defeat of woman suffrage at the last election are as follows:

NEW YORK

"No" 748,332
 "Yes" 553,348

Anti-Suffrage Majority... 194,984

PENNSYLVANIA

"No" 441,034
 "Yes" 385,348

Anti-Suffrage Majority... 55,686

MASSACHUSETTS

"No" 295,702
 "Yes" 162,615

Anti-Suffrage Majority... 133,087

NEW JERSEY

"No" 184,390
 "Yes" 133,282

Anti-Suffrage Majority... 51,108

Total "No" Votes..... 1,669,458

Total "Yes" Votes..... 1,234,593

Total Anti-Suffrage Majority.... 434,865

OTHER DEFEATS

State	Year	Majority Against
Ohio	1912	87,455
Ohio	1914	182,905
Michigan	1912	760
Michigan	1913	96,144
Wisconsin	1912	91,478
Nebraska	1914	10,104
Missouri	1914	140,206
N. Dakota.....	1914	9,401
S. Dakota.....	1914	11,914

THE 1916 CAMPAIGN STATES

IOWA

AMONG the prominent women who will take part in the Iowa campaign is Miss Alice French, of Davenport, who is widely known as Octave Thanet. Miss French is regarded as the ablest woman writer Iowa has produced. Her anti-suffrage sentiments, like those of Mrs. Humphry Ward, Margaret Deland, Ida M. Tarbell, Kate Douglas Wiggin, Anna Katherine Green, Amelia E. Barr and other women writers, are due to a broad experience with human nature and a deep knowledge of what is best for their own sex.

In Des Moines, Mrs. Simon J. Casady, Mrs. Earle S. Culloms and Mrs. P. H. Alderson have secured an excellently situated headquarters in the Hippee building.

Miss Minnie Bronson, Miss Clara Markeson and Miss Marjorie Dorman of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage are assisting the Iowa women in organizing the State against woman suffrage.

Prominent women, it is said, have promised to help the anti-suffragists in every district.

Mrs. Martin Flynn, of Des Moines, who was chairman of the Iowa Committee, recently announced that she will not be able to take part in the present campaign, due to her daughter's illness.

SOUTH DAKOTA

AT a meeting of the State Educational Association at Aberdeen, recently, the woman who made the response to the address of welcome made it a suffrage speech instead and insisted that the meeting should not close until it had voted an indorsement of woman suffrage.

When they came to meet to draft the resolution, a woman from Pierre, who is on the resolutions committee, assured the delegates that she did not want suffrage indorsed. The men were greatly relieved.

The meeting closed without further mention of suffrage.

We believe that the time of equal suffrage is bound to come for South Dakota, but that it will have to be by Federal enactment, because the voters of South Dakota will never see it any other way.—*Canistota Clipper*.

WEST VIRGINIA

IN West Virginia, where the voters will decide the question of woman suffrage in November, the suffragists, with their usual disregard of patent facts, have issued a statement to the effect that the alleged liquor interests are against woman suffrage. West Virginia is a prohibition State, just as Virginia, North and South Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama and other Southern States, where the sentiment against woman suffrage is most intense.

Like Iowa, where woman suffrage comes up at the polls in June, West Virginia has adopted prohibition through the votes of men only.

The only change that could be brought about on this question by women's votes in these States would be to make them "wet."

Socialist speakers in Philadelphia just before the last election pleaded for woman suffrage "because the women kept California wet." California is the largest State where women vote. It gave nearly 200,000 majority against prohibition with women voting. The women politicians of that State, just before the election, issued a magazine pleading for the defeat of prohibition in the largest type they could procure.

There are eighteen prohibition States. Thirteen of them went dry with only men voting. This proves that the women who want prohibition can get it through their husbands just as easily as through their votes. Moreover, the women, without the vote, abolished the army canteen and the sale of liquor on United States property. The facts prove that women really have more influence on this question without the vote than with it, because of the few women who vote the "wet" element can get more to the polls than any other. This has been proved in California, Nevada, Chicago and many other elections where women vote, and is conceded by many advocates of prohibition.

The Anti-Saloon League of New York, for instance, has never indorsed woman suffrage. Maybe the West Virginia "wets" would be more inclined to enfranchise their sisters, cousins, aunts, wives, etc., than the "drys" would. The woman who wants all kinds of freedom is not usually an advocate of prohibition. And she is the woman who would do the most voting and office holding.

A SUCCESSFUL YEAR'S WORK AGAINST SUFFRAGE

CONNECTICUT

THIS Autumn we are entering on the fifth year of our existence. We have secured enrollments in many new towns, and have varying numbers of membership in one hundred and sixty-one towns. We have thirty-three branches and a membership of fifteen thousand. We have just placed twenty-five subscriptions of the *WOMAN'S PROTEST* in public libraries. Our speakers have appeared before all kinds of audiences, both men and women. One of the most important meetings was in New Haven before a "trades union," where three hundred men of all types and nationalities listened with the greatest interest. We have been permitted to speak in several factories during the noon hour, and on the 17th of March, by vote of the Legislature, Miss Lucy Price was invited to address that body, this being the second time that a woman was ever in the speaker's chair in Connecticut.

On April 7th, the House of Representatives voted against the amendment by a small majority. The legislators had had a good deal of time to think the question over, for it had been a month since the hearing when both sides presented their arguments. The whole business of the State of Connecticut was suspended for four and a half days on account of the question of woman suffrage. For weeks previous to the hearing, the Capitol was invaded by women, so that really the activities of the men on Capitol Hill were handicapped by interruptions and the confusion created by such an invasion.

One of the great problems of the anti-suffrage workers is the question of funds. During the last year our expenses amounted to \$4,641.43. We were very proud of our victory with such a small outlay of money.

We have outlined a campaign for the ensuing four months to bring our cause before the men voters. This is to prepare us for the coming struggle in 1916, when our Legislature convenes again. We predict another victory in 1916.

DELAWARE

ON June 18, 1914, the Woman's Committee of Delaware Opposed to Suffrage was formed. As the suffragists had been organized eighteen years and now only claim 4,000 members it was not thought necessary to take any headquarters, or to have any dues and all the executive work so far has been done by the secretary, treasurer and chairman and the funds are raised by personal appeal.

Although organized only eighteen months the Committee has 2,400 names.

After consulting with the prominent men and women who were anti-suffragists it was decided to go to Dover and speak before the Legislature on February 3, 1915. A petition against the amendment to the Constitution of Delaware, signed by over 200 prominent business and professional men of Wilmington was headed by Judge George Gray.

On March 9th the House of Representatives voted on the amendment, the result was: in the House 8 to 22 against, and in the Senate 6 to 11 against.

In September, 1915, a large tent at the State fair gave opportunity for the distribution of literature and buttons and sale of music, flags, canes, hat bands and roses, and over 400 names were secured.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SINCE January, 1915, appeals for literature began to come to us from many of the States in which the suffrage question was to be voted upon, and in order to meet this demand the offices at 1402 H Street were given up and headquarters moved to less expensive rooms in the Oxford Building.

An able pamphlet was prepared refuting the suffragists' claims and copies sent to all members of the Legislatures in every State where the suffrage question was to come up. Sample copies were also sent to all State associations and large orders soon began to come in and our office force was largely increased. Eight hundred and thirty-seven thousand were sent out, of which 133,600 were paid for by the District Association. During the past eighteen months the total number of pieces of literature sent out was 1,017,600.

Over 200 written requests for literature for debates or study have been received and mailed to twenty-nine different States and about 100 sets distributed in the District. The sum of money received and dispensed up to date amounts to \$2,849.84. The coming year promises to bring a spirited fight for the suffrage amendment to the Constitution and this Association hopes to continue to oppose the efforts of those in favor of suffrage with that fairness and sound judgment and dignity which have always been the leading characteristics of the anti-suffragist.

MAINE

SINCE 1913 the activities of this Association have been numerous and much has been accomplished in spite of the difficulties in reaching the people of a widely scattered agricultural community, such as are comprised in the population of Maine.

Monthly meetings, open to the public, have been held in Portland during the winter months. At these meetings our own members have spoken frequently and we have had an occasional speaker from outside the State.

A large amount of literature has been distributed, the greater part of which was compiled and printed by the Association.

Although the State Grange and the W. C. T. U. indorsed woman suffrage, the Federation of Women's Clubs refused to report a suffrage resolution out of the committees, and the teachers' convention did not pass any resolve on the subject, although besieged by the suffragists.

A bill was presented at the Maine Legislature last winter asking that a woman suffrage amendment be added to the State Constitution. A hearing on the subject was granted on February 11th before the Judiciary Committee. The hearing was held in the assembly room which was crowded to the doors, suffragists and anti-suffragists being represented in about equal numbers.

The bill was defeated in the House with nine votes to spare, the suffragists failing to get a two-thirds vote, the record being eighty-eight for, to fifty-nine against the amendment.

There is no session of the Legislature this year.

MASSACHUSETTS

AFTER the defeat of the suffrage referendum in 1895 a little group of earnest workers began at once their campaign of education. Owing to their pioneer efforts, Massachusetts was ready this year to meet the stress and strain of a political campaign.

Our active work began on May 1st with an anti-socialist rally in Faneuil Hall, which was crowded to the doors, with an audience composed largely of men.

On May 15th, followed a mass-meeting at Tremont Temple. On the 27th a rose supper was held at Ford Hall, which was planned to meet an expressed desire on the part of the many wage-earning women to show in some public and pronounced manner their affiliation with the Anti-Suffrage Association. No occasion ever more fully expressed loyalty and sympathy to workers in a common cause than this assemblage of women and girls with their escorts, 560 in number.

In June an anti-suffrage convention was held in the western part of the State, at Springfield. Delegates were present from all over the State, representing more than sixty branches.

A Successful Year's Work Against Suffrage—(Continued)

Later in the summer and through the autumn the county fairs offered a great field for our propaganda, and at almost every fair in the State, about forty in all, there was an anti-suffrage booth, where we distributed literature and gave information to those desiring it. At least 250,000 leaflets were distributed and the work bore much fruit.

Shops were opened in a good many cities for the giving out of literature, roses, buttons, etc. Windows for the exhibition of placards were maintained in many places. Big signs conveying anti-suffrage propaganda were erected in subways, on crowded thoroughfares and on popular boulevards.

Countless meetings were held before granges and before labor organizations and debates with the suffragists, whenever they were willing to meet us.

The men's committee sent speakers on an automobile tour of the State, thereby reaching many street audiences.

On the day of the suffrage parade, anti-suffrage roses were sold for the benefit of the Infant's Hospital. In hotels, on doorsteps, in alleyways and on the streets the anti-suffrage flowers were displayed. Buyers were many and \$1,500 were gathered in for the babies.

The greatest source of power in our campaign work was the men's anti-suffrage committee; made up of men of wide experience in public life, who labored untiringly during the last months to defeat suffrage. These men managed the political end of the campaign and formed an extraordinarily effective organization throughout the State. It is largely due to their splendid work that we owe our overwhelming majority of 133,000.

MICHIGAN

THE sentiment against woman suffrage in Michigan as shown by the large majority in the election after the last active campaign seems to remain unchanged, the feeling being strongly opposed to granting the franchise to women. The distribution of literature is being continued.

A donation was sent to the national organization for use in the campaigns in the four States last fall.

MINNESOTA

SOMETHING over a year ago the Minneapolis Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage was reorganized. We have just held our second annual meeting. The one event of national interest in the past year was the defeat of the proposed amendment to our State Constitution, in the

1914-15 Legislature. Our appeal against the amendment was at least two-fold. First, that the political and so of necessity partisan women lost power as a factor in all humanitarian movements, that she has now in her own hands and major part in questions of expenditure, employment and education, with full power to act. Second, that the ballot for women is not an actual demand in Minnesota. In the State at large it is neither discussed nor desired. The amendment was defeated in the Senate by one vote.

It was never voted upon in the lower house. Two bills were introduced there, one to submit an amendment to our Constitution and the other for franchise under statutory law. We opposed the first for reasons already given and the second because it was contrary to the Constitution of our State, which declares the right to modify the government as a power inherent with the people.

Through the courtesy of the Minneapolis and St. Paul Associations, the State Association had headquarters until August. Since then, we have united with the Minneapolis Association, in leasing a comfortable auditorium and office rooms for the year.

We have had three luncheons, one with an attendance of two hundred and fifty, and have held fifteen executive board meetings. The Minneapolis Association under the leadership of Mrs. Edmund Pennington, raised \$2,436.00 for the Red Cross Fund. We have distributed through the State Association alone forty thousand pamphlets and written twenty-five thousand letters. Our Association has been supported by women interested in it. It has so far been unnecessary to make any outside appeal.

NEBRASKA

THE campaign of 1914 in Nebraska, following close upon the organization of the State Association, and resulting in the defeat of woman suffrage for the second time, was of the whirlwind variety and was followed, as whirlwinds are wont to be, by an intense calm.

That campaign confirmed the belief that a large proportion of the women who are clamoring for the franchise desire it less for use than for ornament.

In Omaha women who pay personal taxes or who have children of school age may vote for members of the school board. This privilege they have had for twenty years. An intelligent estimate places the number of women now eligible to vote at approximately twenty thousand. When the law was new, several hundred availed themselves of it, but after the novelty had worn off they declined to go to the polls, so that

prior to the State campaign of 1914, less than two per cent. participated.

Twenty thousand special pamphlets were distributed in the rural districts during the year.

With the assistance of the Men's League, a bill for municipal suffrage was defeated in the legislature in February last at an outlay of \$100, and an attempt to obtain an endorsement of equal suffrage by the Nebraska Farmers' Congress was also frustrated by them.

A wage-earners branch of our Association is also at work. Its officers are business women and its membership is confined solely to those women and girls who are in the wage-earning world.

Early in the history of the Nebraska Association its members undertook a study of the statutes governing child labor and those relating to the personal and property rights of women. Those of our own State, many of them modeled upon the laws governing older communities, compare favorably with those of any State in the Union, and are far in advance of neighboring States where women have long possessed the franchise. These man-made laws are far more favorable to women than to men.

NEW JERSEY

SINCE the last annual meeting the Woman Suffrage Amendment to our Constitution in New Jersey was passed a second time by our Legislature and allowed to come before the voters for a decision. As the law in New Jersey requires that elections on amendments to the Constitution must be special elections, and the power to fix the date rests with the Legislature, we asked for a late date—October or late in September. The suffragists wanted an early date—either the day after Labor Day or the 14th of September. We felt it only fair to the State that there should be a full vote on a question of such vital importance. October 19th was chosen.

Early in our campaign the suffragists issued a statement that they would not debate with us. We did succeed later in having about six debates. The Federation of Labor and Women's Clubs refused to indorse woman suffrage. The vote on the amendment was almost as large as for Governor at a general election. We defeated suffrage by 51,108 majority. It is interesting to note that every suffrage leader lost her own district except Mrs. Colby, who won by seven votes.

The membership is about 26,000. The expense of the campaign since February, when the question was submitted to the people, was \$14,000.

A Successful Year's Work Against Suffrage—(Continued)

NEW YORK

THE amendment was defeated in New York State by over 194,000 majority. Four counties, Chautauqua, Tompkins, Broome and Schenectady, gave a majority for the amendment. We had difficulty in getting hearings in any of these counties, which is an additional proof that where the anti-suffrage arguments are understood the people are convinced of the soundness of the principles upon which our opposition to woman suffrage is based.

The size of the rural vote against the amendment in some sections was quite a surprise to us. We believe that the Chautauqua circuit in the State last summer is in a measure responsible for this.

Another means we took of reaching the up-State voters was by attending the county fairs, where we had booths to distribute our literature, and in many instances had speakers also. We covered forty-five of them, reaching thousands of the voters by this means.

Brooklyn stands out as the banner city and Kings County, which embraces Brooklyn, as the banner county. Every election district in Brooklyn gave a majority against suffrage.

Westchester County was for years a suffrage stronghold. An organizer was put at work there during the summer, and as a result Westchester County gave a majority of about 4,500 against suffrage.

Albany has the oldest anti-suffrage auxiliary in the State. The work of the women there was very ably supplemented by that of the men. The work in Buffalo was conducted along slightly different lines, as the voters were of a different type. The men were reached at their work. Noon meetings were held at the large manufacturing plants, at the railroad shops and the iron steel mills. Erie County gave a majority against suffrage of over 10,000.

Utica carried on a splendid publicity campaign and they extended their work to some of its smaller towns also.

One of the most vigorous suffrage campaigns was carried on in Delaware County. Not only did the county go against suffrage, but the town of Delhi, where the chief suffrage worker lived, went on record against the proposition.

These are only a few of the counties in which special work was done and which stand out as showing the results of that work.

We concentrated our efforts on advertising during the final weeks of our campaign. The suffragists thought we would not be heard from in that way and they

were plainly disturbed when our advertisements suddenly appeared in every subway car, in every surface car, the elevated railroad stations and the Fifth Avenue stages. We lay special stress on the fact that less than 10 per cent. of the women of New York were asking for suffrage, and it was this point that caused the suffragists to put out their ridiculous statement that a million women in New York were asking for suffrage. It was not difficult for us to riddle this statement by showing that it was based upon a post-card canvass made by the *New York World* in March, 1915. Of the thousands of women to whom postal card inquiries were sent only about 15 per cent. answered. Of that 15 per cent. about 70 per cent. expressed themselves in favor of the extension of the franchise to women. It is obvious that 85 per cent. who did not reply at all were either opposed to the extension of suffrage or were indifferent. Assuming, as the suffragists did, that the women of voting age in New York State numbered 2,700,000, it is evident from the *World* canvass that no more than 283,500, or 70 per cent. of 15 per cent., or approximately 10 per cent. of the whole, are in favor of the extension of the suffrage to women. We therefore have the result of this canvass upon which to base our assertion that only 10 per cent. of the women of New York State wish the suffrage.

PENNSYLVANIA

OUR current year opened with a State conference and luncheon at the residence of the president. Members from various parts of the State spoke of the difficulty of arousing the antis to an appreciation of the danger and the need of work.

Following the State conference, during the winter and spring months teas were given by members of the association at their own houses at which there were informal talks and reports of work being done by the association.

Meetings were arranged in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and other towns and cities in the State and speakers sent to a number of clubs. Study clubs were carried on in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

We had booths at thirty-three fairs; our workers remaining during the entire fair and distributing literature in the district in which the fair was held.

We rented stores in sixteen towns and cities through the State, in many cases during the holding of some convention or old home week. In Philadelphia a store was rented in the business section of the city the week of the May suffrage parade, and

three stores were opened in different sections of the city during the last month of the campaign, and Pittsburgh had one.

Good work was also done by members of the Pennsylvania State Grange of Bradford County.

The Public Interests Committee had booths at three bazaars where articles were sold for the benefit of the charity, and anti-suffrage buttons and literature were distributed.

Through the Publicity Bureau articles were published in over one hundred papers in the State.

The campaign closed with an enthusiastic rally at the Academy of Music, attended by over 2000 people.

RHODE ISLAND

THE work of the Rhode Island Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage for 1915 was chiefly in connection with the legislative activities of the suffragists, who made strong attempts to force a bill granting Presidential suffrage to women through both houses of the Legislature. This attempt was defeated. We appeared at several hearings, both private and open. One of these was an open meeting held in the Chamber of the House, one of the largest ever held there. In spite of the fact that the suffragists were represented by senators from suffrage States, the Committee of the House felt that the arguments of our women speakers had much more weight than those of the suffragists and refused to report the bill.

We have distributed much literature during the year and added a thousand to our membership.

TEXAS

ANTI-SUFFRAGE activities are but in the initial stage in Texas. The history of the woman suffrage movement in Texas records the existence of the political equality league in Houston for twelve or more years past. This and other similar organizations in various other Texas cities paved the way for the spectacular suffrage campaign conducted in Texas in 1913. During the last session of the Legislature the Burmeister resolution number 19, which provided for the submission to the qualified voter of Texas the question of extending the vote to the women of Texas was defeated in the lower house. It did not reach the Senate, where a far worse fate awaited it. This in the face of a powerful and thoroughly organized suffragist lobby which by

A Successful Year's Work Against Suffrage—(Concluded)

correspondence and personal appeal had reached every member of the House and Senate again and again.

On the invitation of several members of the legislature opposing the Burmeister resolution in the House, Mrs. James B. Wells of Brownsville, Tex., went to Austin to represent the large majority of Texas women who are opposed to woman suffrage. There was no anti-suffrage lobby, nor any need of one. We were simply asked if we were opposed to suffrage, and why. We were prepared to answer both questions. It was never necessary or did we directly or indirectly ask any member of the Texas legislature to vote against the Burmeister resolution. In her work at Austin Mrs. Wells received the invaluable aid and co-operation of Mrs. J. T. Garrison of Houston and the support of many leading Austin women as well as letters and telegrams in support of her work to men and women all over the State.

In May, the Houston Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage was inaugurated, which now has over 600 members and is working most energetically, sending literature in every direction and enlisting the support of many. This association is now actively planning to engage in a systematic educational campaign in the near future.

The outlook all over the State of Texas is improving. Letters and verbal expressions from men and women of every walk in life testify almost daily to the increasing strength of the anti-suffrage current. The famous suffrage wave in Texas, as elsewhere, is an outgoing and not an incoming one.

VERMONT

IN October, 1914, the small band of women in Burlington deemed the interest in the question of equal suffrage so slight and the prospect of its accomplishment so small that it was decided to disband the Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

After much discussion and finding that the usual bill for granting partial suffrage to women was to be presented to the Legislature at its approaching assembly, it was decided to organize fully and to carry on as much work as possible to prevent the measure from passing the legislative body.

Accordingly full organization was made, a constitution adopted and officers elected, Committees were appointed, petitions circulated, pledge cards of membership were signed and several important public meetings were held which created wide interest and much public sentiment.

A public hearing for the Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage was arranged in the Hall of Representatives at Montpelier. The hearing was largely attended by the legislators and the public and the "antis" attended in a body. The influence left by the sentiment of the suffrage campaign speakers was swept away by the strength and vigor of the anti speakers.

The "bill" passed the Senate and was lost in the House by 29 on a yea-and-nay vote. The next day it was recalled for reconsideration and was lost by 132, showing that a reaction had set in. A few days later hardly a man was to be found who favored woman suffrage. *Still* the suffragists called it a great victory.

On October 28, 1915, at the annual meeting held in Burlington, the State organization showed a membership of 1,245, a small surplus in the treasury and a good bit of fighting "Vermont spirit" left to arouse the sentiment of the indifferent women of the State.

The present board of officers have met with a rising and increasing enthusiasm, an awakening of those women who at heart are opposed to suffrage but have thought the dangers of suffrage so remote that no definite or active stand was necessary. Many are now lending their names and influence to actively oppose the suffrage. A quiet, dignified campaign on educational lines is outlined for the ensuing year and I bespeak for the women of the Green Mountain State that they will line up to the far-famed reputation of the Green Mountain boys and do their full duty.

VIRGINIA

THE first three months of the year 1915 found the Virginia Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage very much handicapped in its work. Our corresponding secretary was unavoidably absent from Richmond, where we have our headquarters, and the health of our president, Miss Rutherford, was so bad that in March she was compelled to resign, to the great regret of the Association. Mrs. Frank D. Williams was elected president at our annual meeting on March 4th, and after a few weeks of reorganization the Association started in earnest on its year's work.

Since March, 1915, we have more than doubled our membership, and have succeeded in greatly enlarging our work outside of Richmond. The business of rousing the people throughout the State has been our chief object this year, and our efforts in this direction are showing decided results. Calls for literature have been widespread and so numerous that we can

scarcely keep a sufficient amount on hand to answer them. We now have ten branch associations in Salem, Graham, Clifton Forge, Fredericksburg, Chester, Lexington, Clarksville, Shawsville, Scottsville, Charlottesville and Crofton, Va. Our Charlottesville branch has been most successful during the past two months, and we have over 300 new members there.

We have succeeded in having anti-suffrage articles published in the county newspapers, of which there are nearly 100 in the State. We have also been most fortunate in securing the support of the editor of one of the largest evening papers in Richmond, which has a wide circulation through Virginia. His most valuable help has been in a series of strong editorials that we have since had reprinted to use as campaign literature when the legislature meets next month. Our most important morning paper has recently promised to print editorials for us, so we feel we have made considerable gains in our efforts for publicity.

In addition to this we are endeavoring to reach every voter in the State by means of letters enclosing anti-suffrage literature. This is a slow and expensive work, but thousands of letters have already been sent out and the cordial answers we have received make us feel it is well worth the cost. Even when we receive no answer we get a certain amount of publicity from sending our stamped envelopes into districts that probably never knew before that such an Association existed.

Though most of our attention this year has been directed to the State in general, our work in Richmond has not been neglected. Hundreds of new members have been secured there, the majority of them among the girls working in department stores and factories. We have also started a Junior Association, for girls under twenty-one.

Our new Advisory Committee of prominent Richmond men has proved very helpful. Not only have they given us many good suggestions, but they have also supported us with some substantial cheques. At present they are giving us valuable assistance in our efforts to reach the Legislators who will assemble here in January. Altogether we consider 1915 has been our most successful year, and if we make as great gains this winter as we have during the past six months, woman suffrage in Virginia will be a very remote possibility.

NOTES AND COMMENT

MISS IDA M. TARBELL, known throughout the country for her research work and her brilliant contributions to current literature on social problems, speaking before the Woman's Auxiliary Congress recently, declared that "the just training of the average girl, as of the average boy, must be based on a consideration of what the girl probably will do during the remainder of her life."

Continuing, Miss Tarbell said in part:

"The average girl marries. The census of 1910 showed that at that time there were nearly 30,000,000 women and girls over fifteen years of age in the United States. Of this number seventy per cent. were, or had been married or would marry. That proves that the future state of the average girl is matrimony."

Miss Tarbell said that of the 30,000,000 about 7,250,000 were engaged in gainful occupations, but that the average period of working life is short, from three to five years.

"The girl who works marries," she added. "In the vast majority of cases her occupation then becomes the complicated and socially important one of housekeeping and child raising. This is her business. In the vast majority of cases she must do her work on a small income. The results are deplorable. Economically the woman is an unskilled worker, spending an income produced by a skilled worker, that is, by labor to which her partner in the business of making a home and rearing a family has been trained. From an economic standpoint this relation is as unfair as it is wasteful."

Miss Tarbell is an anti-suffragist. Like many others, she sees that what women need is training for their own work rather than votes or instruction in imitating the occupations of men. There is a greater need of better homes than of more politics.

A letter received from the Canadian Anti-Suffrage Association says: "We have given up all propaganda work for war work, this last awful year. The suffragists have been going harder than ever. With all our dear ones fighting and every hour taken up in relief work, we have had little time or heart to keep abreast of the question."

New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts appear to be responsible for putting the rage in suffrage.

—Columbia State.

There is no shortage of munitions of war in the suffragists' camp. What they need is more men.—New York World.

Now that it's all over we would like to know who was the guy that figured out the 500,000 majority for suffrage. We would like him to figure our bank account.

—Ilion, N. Y., News.

TO LEAP OR NOT TO LEAP

(Boston, Mass., Advertiser.)

Everybody in America knows Inez Milholland, the beautiful suffragist, who started her career by stirring up feminist agitation in staid old Vassar college, scorned New York society, practiced law in the police courts and finally got herself jailed in England for rioting with Mrs. Pankhurst's "wild women."

There was amazement in the suffrage ranks when she suddenly became the wife of Eugene Boissevain. Feminists marveled that their dashing young general had consented to become the mere wife of a mere man. They wondered how young Mr. Boissevain did it.

Then came the most amazing act of Inez's amazing career. She calmly announced that she did the proposing!

This most beautiful of all suffragists further admitted that she had to pop the question three times before the man of her choice accepted.

Here is her advice to all girls who wish to propose:

"Let her go toward the man with extended hand. Let her put her case to him freely and frankly three times if necessary. I did!

"Leap year or any other year I am for woman's free education, free work and free speech in love as well as out of it.

"To me it is much more dignified to say the actual words 'Let us mate,' than to resort to lures and to seek to place the responsibility elsewhere."

Chicago, Jan. 1.—"This leap year opportunity is fine business for the girl who likes the blushing, timid, clinging-vine type of young man," Mrs. Grace Wilbur Trout, suffrage leader, said to-night:

"But personally, I don't think I would fall in love with any man who didn't have enough spunk to propose to me, leap year or no leap year.

"WHILE IT LASTS"

(Life, Jan. 6.)

IT has been announced to Massachusetts that Mrs. Inez Haynes Gilmore has decided to leave that State and move to California, where she can vote.

Too bad! It will be not only a great mortification and loss to Massachusetts, but a mistake on Mrs. Gilmore's part. The reaction on suffrage will hit California before it hits Massachusetts, and send her back home in sorrow and at vain expense.

Nevertheless, if Mrs. Gilmore wants to catch woman suffrage somewhere while it lasts, there is something to be said for that.

"MONEY COULD NOT INFLUENCE WOMEN"

(Scranton, Pa., Times)

AN interesting interview with the leader of "the cause" here in yesterday's Times indicated that the State suffragists were unappreciative of the results obtained in Lackawanna county because the locals were short on raising their percentage of the campaign fund. * * *

The showing of the local suffragists in the recent campaign and the fact that their influence made it possible in the legislature of 1913, to obtain the approval of the State Senate for the resolution submitting the amendment to the voters of the State, entitle the Lackawanna women to greater consideration than they have received at the hands of their sisters in other sections of the State who were long on funds but shy on votes.

MILITANT METHODS

SUFFRAGISTS deplore "indirect influence," which is the term they apply to the activity of non-partisan women in urging better legislation—but they are not above applying *underhand influence* with prominent men in an attempt to keep their wives from using their well-known power in public opinion. The following dispatch to the *New York Herald* illustrates the point—and the cowardice of women who use black-hand tactics to "purify" politics:

Washington, Dec. 16th.—Mildly militant suffragists have begun a campaign against Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr., wife of the junior Senator from New York. Their attacks have taken the form of anonymous letters addressed to the Senator in which his wife is berated for the pronounced position which she has taken in opposition to the enfranchisement of women. Several such letters have been received by Senator Wadsworth since the opening of Congress. They intimate that the Senator may be held to accountability for the attitude of his wife. Some of them ask him to "control" her and force her to cease her activities in opposition to suffrage.

Mrs. Wadsworth is the daughter of the late John Hay, and in the recent campaign for the suffrage amendment in New York took a conspicuous part on the side of the women opposed to suffrage.

Letters similar to those addressed to Senator Wadsworth have also been received recently by Secretary Lansing, requesting him to stop the activities of Mrs. Lansing, who is also opposed to woman suffrage. Mrs. Lansing is the daughter of John W. Foster, former Secretary of State.

THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE FOUNDED 1895

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Complete set, 50 cts. Single copies, 5 cts.
Selected packages, 25 cts.

PAMPHLETS

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Should We Ask for the Suffrage? *Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer*
Woman's Relation to Government *Mrs. Wm. F. Scott*
The Blank Cartridge Ballot *Rossiter Johnson*
Address (Made before Constitutional Convention, 1894) *Hon. Elihu Root*
Taxation and Suffrage *Frederick Dwight*
Woman and the Law *Francis M. Scott*
First Legislative Address *Mrs. Francis M. Scott*
The Woman Suffrage Crisis
(Editorial, *New York Times*, February, 8, 1915)
Suffragists Desert Philanthropy, etc.
Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law
Dodgers

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Woman Suffrage Opposed to Woman's Rights *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Case Against Votes for Women *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Militant and the Child *Mrs. F. M. Scott*
Woman's Rights vs. Woman's Suffrage *Mrs. A. J. George*
Equality of Suffrage Means the Debasement, etc. *John R. Dos Passos*
Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation *Minnie Bronson*
Wage-Earning Woman and the State *Minnie Bronson*
The Relation of the Sexes to Government *Prof. Edward Cope*
A Talk to Women on the Suffrage Question *Miss Emily P. Bissell*
Should Women Vote? *Joseph Gilpin Pyle*
Xantippe on Woman Suffrage *Reprint from Yale Review*
Feminism and Socialism *Reprint from Unpopular Review*
Dodgers—Statistics
Silk Pins.....10c. each Ribbon.....10c. and 15c. a yard
Celluloid Buttons.....5c. Pennants.....15c. and 25c.
New Poster Stamps.....35c. a hundred
Cartoon—Population Votes.....50c.
New Song—The Anti-Suffrage Rose.....10c.

MAN-SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION

27 William Street Room 1903 New York City

PUBLICATIONS

The Woman and the Vote. Address Carnegie Hall, January 26, 1914 *Everett P. Wheeler*
Questionnaire to Professors in Universities and Colleges *Prof. Munroe Smith*
Feminist Revolutionary Principle Biologically Unsound *Prof. William T. Sedgwick*
Brief Before the Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, December, 1913 *Everett P. Wheeler*
Brief Submitted to House of Representatives, July, 1914 *Everett P. Wheeler*
Colorado and Suffrage *John C. Ten Eyck*

Consent of the Governed *Prof. Munroe Smith*
The Woman Suffrage Crisis. Editorial, *New York Times*, February 8, 1915

Brief on Woman Suffrage; Political Suffrage for Women Subversive of American Ideals

The Laws of New York Favor and Protect Woman *Raymond B. Seymour, of the New York Bar*

What Women Have Done Without the Ballot *Everett P. Wheeler*

(Republished by Permission from *The Reply*)
The Influence of Christianity Upon the Condition of Woman *Everett P. Wheeler*

Price 5 cents Each—\$3.00 a hundred—25 for \$1.00

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING

Woman Adrift (\$1.50) *Harold Owen*
The Nature of Woman (\$1.25) *J. Lionel Taylor*
Vocation of Woman (\$1.50) *Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun*
The Business of Being a Woman (\$1.50) *Ida Tarbell*
The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage (\$1.00) *Sir Almroth Wright*
The Ladies' Battle (\$1.00) *Molly Elliott Seawell*
Book of Woman's Power (\$1.25) *E. S. Martin*
The Unrest of Women (\$1.00)
Votes for Men (50c.)
Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons (50c.) *Grace Duffield Goodwin*
Woman and the Republic (25c.) *Mrs. Rossiter Johnson*

These can be obtained by applying to
THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

The Remonstrance.....Subscription, 25c.
687 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

Some pamphlets issued by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts.

The Case Against Woman Suffrage. A Manual.
Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage *Francis Parkman*
Argument before U. S. Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage *Mrs. A. J. George*

Of What Benefit to Woman?
Why I Am Opposed to Woman Suffrage *Jeannette L. Gilder*
Letter to Legislative Committee *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*
Municipal Suffrage for Women—Why? *Frank Foscroft*
Taxpaying Suffrage *Charles R. Saunders*
Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and not to Men

Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage *Ida M. Tarbell*
Woman Suffrage in Practice—An Answer to George Creel
Address in Opposition to Woman Suffrage

Mrs. George A. Caswell
Anti-Suffrage Manual (15c. a copy) *Mrs. Albert T. Leatherbee*
An Anti-Suffrage Creed *Adapted from Octavia Hill*
A Social Worker's View of Suffrage *Mrs. Wm. Lowell Putnam*

Suffrage Statements Answered *Caroline M. Parker*
Twelve Anti-Suffrage Reasons *Frank Foscroft*
Why a Man Should Oppose Woman Suffrage *Mrs. A. J. George (Independent)*
Woman Suffrage Must Fail *Margaret C. Robinson*
Woman Suffrage a Menace to Social Reform

Woman Suffrage a Failure in California

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association,
KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615
687 Boylston Street BOSTON, MASS.

Selected Packages, 25c.

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

.....1915

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find \$.....for.....year's subscription

Name

Street

City State.....

Subscription Rate, \$1.00 a year. Make checks payable to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST.

If you wish to subscribe for a friend, write the name below and include the amount in your remittance.

Name

Street

City

State